

Points, as may be warranted by Holy Scripture, and such as these are the Subject of the *Nine and Thirty Articles*: but as for *Pope Pius's Creed*, 'tis but the Invention of Men.

Ans. I have shew'd above, all the Articles of this Creed to be founded upon *Scripture* and the *Authority* of the most Eminent Men in the Primitive Church. And let but any one lay aside the Bent of Education, and he'll find the *Nine and Thirty Articles* not so express in Scripture, as these of *Pope Pius*. *The Procession of the Ho'y Ghost from the Father and the Son*, Art. 5. *Two whole and Perfect Natures in one Person, never to be divided in Christ*, Art. 2. Where are these so plain in Scripture, that one who has not been Educated to the Belief of them, might not easily call them in question; since there is no mention either of *Procession* or *Person* throughout Holy Writ? Might not the same doubt be made of the *Number of Canonical Books*, and of the *Sacraments*; Neither of them being determin'd in Scripture? Is it not the same of *Original Sin*? If a Man could not believe any of these Articles, because they are not express'd in Scripture, who can help it?

Thus we see all the reasons, that are pretended for the rejecting *Pope Pius's Creed*, equally to stand in force against the *Nine and Thirty Articles*, nay and against the *Nicen* and *Athanasian Creed*: And that to receive these Two, and then withstand the Creed of this Prelate, is not so much of Reason, as of Obstinacy or Humor, which still appears more evident, when having cast by this Creed of *Pope Pius*, they readily, subscribe to the *Nine and Thirty Articles*, which are urg'd with greater Difficulty, and have the same Objections against them, as the rejected Creed.

F I N I S.

Points, as may be warranted by Holy Scripture, and such as these are the Subject of the *Nine and Thirty Articles*: but as for *Pope Pius's Creed*, 'tis but the Invention of Men.

Ans. I have shew'd above, all the Articles of this Creed to be founded upon *Scripture* and the *Authority* of the most Eminent Men in the Primitive Church. And let but any one lay aside the Bent of Education, and he'll find the *Nine and Thirty Articles* not so express in Scripture, as these of *Pope Pius*. *The Procession of the Ho'y Ghost from the Father and the Son*, Art. 5. *Two whole and Perfect Natures in one Person, never to be divided in Christ*, Art. 2. Where are these so plain in Scripture, that one who has not been Educated to the Belief of them, might not easily call them in question; since there is no mention either of *Procession* or *Person* throughout Holy Writ? Might not the same doubt be made of the *Number of Canonical Books*, and of the *Sacraments*; Neither of them being determin'd in Scripture? Is it not the same of *Original Sin*? If a Man could not believe any of these Articles, because they are not express'd in Scripture, who can help it?

Thus we see all the reasons, that are pretended for the rejecting *Pope Pius's Creed*, equally to stand in force against the *Nine and Thirty Articles*, nay and against the *Nicen* and *Athanasian Creed*: And that to receive these Two, and then withstand the Creed of this Prelate, is not so much of Reason, as of Obstinacy or Humor, which still appears more evident, when having cast by this Creed of *Pope Pius*, they readily, subscribe to the *Nine and Thirty Articles*, which are urg'd with greater Difficulty, and have the same Objections against them, as the rejected Creed.

F I N I S.

THE
Additional Articles
Rome, 1714
Pope Pius's Creed,
NO
ARTICLES
OF THE
CHRISTIAN FAITH.
BEING AN
ANSWER

To a Late PAMPHLET, Intituled,
Pope PIUS his profession of Faith Vindi-
cated from Novelty in Additional Articles.

AND
The PROSPECT of *POPERY*, taken from
that Authentick Record, with short NOTES
thereupon, DEFENDED.

Mr. Aetham.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. L. for Luke Meredith, at the Angel in
Amen-Corner, MDC LXXXVIII.

IMPRIMATUR.

Mart. 22.

1671.

Gmil. Needham, R. R. in Christo
P. ac D. D. Whilhelmo Archiep.
Canthuar. à Sacr. Domest.

THE
ADDITIONAL ARTICLES
IN
Pope Pius's Creed,
NO
ARTICLES
OF THE
CHRISTIAN FAITH.

AMONG those many and great grievances which we complain of in the Church of *Rome*, the Additional Articles of Pope *Pius IV.* are none of the least. We look upon them as Additions to the ancient Faith, imposed with great severity, and as Novelties introduced into the Church, without any Authority. But the Vindicator tells us, That though we of the Church of *England* be the most forward; yet we, of all sorts of Christians, have the least reason to condemn this Prelate for this Addition; who, for XXIV. Articles in his Profession, have XXXIX. in our own. If this were true, or the Additions were of the same kind, this Remarque of his might pass among thinking Men; as very considerable. But had this Gentleman been so Thinking a person as he would make the World believe he is, he would not have been guilty of so great a Blunder; he would have seen a vast difference between Articles of

A 2 *Faith,*

The Additional Articles in Pope Pius's Creed,

Faith, and Articles of *Communion*. We do not find fault with the Church of *Rome*, or any particular Church, or any Society of Men, whether Sacred or Civil, for making Laws and Rules to govern themselves by, or framing Articles, upon compliance wherewith they will admit into, or acknowledge any one to be a Member of their Society; provided they be such as may be complied with, without Sin and Danger. But we deny, that the Church of *Rome*, or any particular Church, or the Catholick Church it self hath any Authority to make new Articles of Faith, or declare any thing as necessary to be Believed in order to Man's Salvation, which was not so antecedent to such Declaration. And this I take to be the true state of the Question between us and the Church of *Rome*; and not as the Vindicator states it, *Whether there be Authority in the Catholick Church of Christ, which-soever it be, to make any Addition of Articles to the Apostles Creed, and require other terms of Communion, besides the assenting to what is expressed in that Symbol?* Upon this mistaken Question the Vindicator proceeds, and all along fights with his own shadow, not with us; for all that we say is only this, *That no new Articles of Faith ought to be added to the Apostles Creed*; but we never denied, That other terms of Communion, besides the assenting to what is expressed in that Symbol, may, by any Church, be required of Her Members. Unless therefore the Vindicator do make it appear, That new Articles of Faith, *de jure*, may be, or, *de facto*, have been, by consent of the Catholick Church, added to the Apostles Creed; he will not at all impugn the Church of *England*, nor will the Church of *Rome* be much indebted to him for his Vindication. Now, whether he doth, or hath made this appear, will best be seen, by taking his Instances into Consideration, by which he pretends and endeavours to do it. But before I do that, it may be convenient to acquaint you what is the just and true differences between Articles of *Faith*, and Articles of *Communion*.

Articles of *Faith*, I take to be certain Propositions, containing such divine Verities as are necessary to be believed and assented to by all Christians, in order to their Salvation.

Articles of *Communion*, I take to be some certain Laws or Rules agreed upon and established by some particular Society of Christians; a compliance wherewith is necessary to the admittance of any one as a Member of that Society, and an Observance whereof is necessary to the Peace, Order, and good Government of that Society.

The former of these are certain Fundamental Verities, taught us by God, revealed in the holy Scriptures, and summarily comprized in the Apostles Creed. For this we have the Authority of the *Trent Catechism*, * and therefore may reasonably suppose that it will not

* Catech.
ad Paro-
chos par.
1. Tit. de
12. Sym-
boli Arti-
culis, n. 1.

be disowned by those of the Roman *Communion*. And if this be granted, then methinks the Consequence is plain, That whatsoever is not contained in the Apostles Creed, is not to be admitted as an Article of Faith. For there are many Truths revealed by God in holy Scriptures, all which, when known to be so revealed, are necessary to be believed; yet are they not all of equal necessity to Salvation, and consequently not to be admitted as Articles of Faith in the strict and proper acceptation of the Word.

The latter are things of a quite different nature, respecting principally the Peace, Order, and good Government of some particular Society, necessary to be assented to and observed by all the Members thereof, but not by all Christians. For there are great Numbers of Ecclesiastical Societies in the World, all or most of which have different terms of Communion, which the Members of every particular Society are obliged to comply with; but the Members of one Society are not under the same Obligation to observe the Constitutions of another, as they are to do those of their own.

The Catholick Church, we know, is divided into several particular Churches, differing in the terms of their Communion; and yet none will deny, but that the terms of Communion in each particular Church are to be observed, in order to those ends before mentioned, by the respective Members of those several Churches. 'Tis true indeed, that all those particular Churches are Members of the Catholick Church, and do, or ought to hold Communion with her in Faith and Worship, and upon the same terms with one another: But as to what relates to the admitting of Members into, or casting them out of their Society, they have different terms, and always have had without blame, and without any the least breach of that general Communion.

But to bring the Instance a little nearer, the Church of *Rome*, which calls her self Catholick, hath many particular Societies within her self, as the *Benedictines*, the *Franciscans*, the *Dominicans*, the *Jesuits*, &c. all which have particular Laws and Rules, and those different from one another, which are the Bands and Ligaments of their several Societies. And yet the Vindicator will not deny, but that they are all true Members of the Church, and do hold Communion with her, and with one another, notwithstanding those different terms of Communion among themselves.

By what hath been said, you may easily observe a vast difference between these two sorts of Articles, which difference I shall briefly recapitulate to you in these Four particulars.

I. *Church Communion*, it is plain, is of two sorts, either with the

the Catholick, or with a particular Church. Now it must be acknowledged, That Articles of Faith properly so called, are really terms of Communion with the *Catholick Church*; for by our Profession of them it is, that we are look'd upon as Christians, and own'd as members of the *Catholick Church*. But they are not, nor cannot be the only terms of Communion with any particular Church; for it is not by owning and assenting to the terms of Communion with any particular Church, that we are called Christians, but only Christians of such or such a Denomination, (i. e.) We are upon our compliance with such terms, look'd upon as Members of such a particular Society of Christians.

II. *Articles of Faith* properly so called, are certain Fundamental Verities, revealed by God in holy Scripture, and summarily comprized in the *Apostles Creed*: But meer Articles of Communion with any particular Church, are no fundamental Verities of Religion, though they may be fundamental Constitutions of a Society; nor is it necessary that they should all be revealed by God, but may be invented by Men; and certain it is, that all of them never were comprized either in the *Apostles*, or any other ancient *Creed*.

III. *Articles of Faith* are the same to all Christians, being such fundamental Verities as all ought to believe and assent thereunto. But *Articles of Communion* are various, each Community having different terms of Communion from another; so that the Members of one Society, though they stand obliged to comply with, observe, and assent unto the terms of Communion established and required of them by their own Body, yet are they not any way obliged to comply with, observe, or assent unto the terms of Communion required in another.

IV. *Articles of Faith* are certain fundamental Verities, necessary to be believed and assented to by all Christians, in order to their Salvation. but *Articles of Communion*, as such, are not necessary to the Salvation of Men, but only to the Peace, Order, and good Government of a Society. For a Member of one Society may be safe and saved at last, without complying with the terms of Communion established by another.

Having thus represented to you the difference between these two sorts of Articles, I shall now proceed to consider the Vindicator's Instances, by which he endeavours to prove, That it is in the power of the Church to add unto the *Apostles Creed*, not only other *Articles of Communion*, besides the assenting to what is expressed in that Symbol, but also other *Articles of Faith*.

His first Instance is, The acknowledged practice of the Primitive Church,

Church, in the time of her confessed Purity. This is a mighty Instance, and if he can make any thing of it to evince the Addition of any new Article of Faith to the *Apostles Creed* in that time, he will do a great Work; for we own there is a great deal of difference due to the practice of the Primitive Church in that time. But instead of so doing, he acknowledgeth that the *Apostles Creed* was the only summary of the Christian Faith known in the first Three hundred Years. And if so, then the Church, in all that time, never thought it necessary to add any new Article thereunto. But after this time, saith he, upon occasion of the *Arian Heretic*, another *Creed* was composed by the Council of *Nice*, with an expresse condemnation and detestation of that new broach'd Error, in the Addition of these Words, in relation to the Divinity of the Son; *I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, *born of his Father before all Worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God* * For be-
of very God, begotten not made, consubstantial to the Father. And with-
out the expresse assenting to this Addition, none could be admitted to Ordination, or be acknowledged as Members of the Church. Which *Creed*, with this Addition, was received by the whole Church, and Subscription to it is required by the Church of England, Art. VIII.

Here this Gentleman, as he thinks, hath found a considerable Addition to the *Apostles Creed*, and that made by no less Authority than that of the Famous Council of *Nice*. But certainly never any Thinking Man besides himself ever thought this to be an Addition to, but only an Explication of the *Apostles Creed*, or a Declaration of what was the Sence of the Church in those Three hundred Years proceeding, touching that Article of the *Apostles Creed*. And whereas he saith, *That without the expresse Assenting to this Addition*, (as he calls it) *none could be admitted to Ordination, or be acknowledged as Members of the Church*: It is very true, but little to his purpose; for what doth this import? but only that an Assent to this Explication was required as a term of Communion, but not that it should be owned as a new Article of Faith. And whereas he further saith, *That this Creed, with this Addition, was received by the whole Church, and a Subscription to it is now required by the Church of England, Art. VIII*. It is very true, and the Church of England in the same Article will tell him upon what Grounds she now doth, and the Church then did receive this *Creed*. The Three *Creeds*, *Nice Creed*, *Athanasius's Creed*, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain Warrants of holy Scripture. So that upon the whole matter, it is very evident, That the Council of *Nice* makes no new Article, but only explains an old one.

The same Answer may serve to his two next Instances out of the *Athanasian* and *Constantinopolitan Creeds*, in which, upon like Occasions, we meet with Explications of some other Articles of the *Apostles Creed*; but no Addition of any new Article thereunto.

But our Vindicator, being a mighty Thinking Man, hath found out a way not only of confounding Articles of Faith with Articles of Communion, but also of jumbling Additions and Explications together, as if they were one and the same thing. And if you will allow this Issue of his so pregnant Thoughts, you shall not want a Vindication of the most absurd Doctrines, and irregular Practices in the Church of *Rome*; but if you deny him this, you take away the Foundation he is to build upon, and then it would be unreasonable for you to expect any good and durable Superstructure from him.

This is plain from his next Instance, which is taken from the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of *England*, in which (he saith) are many particular Points not found in the Symbol of the Apostles, nor yet in any of the forementioned *Creeds* of the Primitive Church. Whence he concludes, That the Church of *England* hath greater variety, and a greater number of Additional Articles than the Church of *Rome*. To make good which conclusion, he must, according to his new way of Thinking, take all the Articles of our Church to be Articles of Faith strictly and properly so called, as necessary to be received and believed by all Men, in order to their Salvation,

Bulla Pii (as the Articles of Pope *Pius IV.* are declared to be) or else the force
4ti. apud of his Argument is quite lost. For if they be only Articles of Com-
Concil. munion, such as are necessary only for our admittance into, and
Trid. our peaceable and orderly living in that Society, of which we are

Art. VI. Members; then are they no Additions to the *Apostles Creed*, which only contains Articles of Faith. And that they are so, will evidently appear, if the Church of *England* may be but allowed to speak for her self. She will tell us, That the Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to Salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any Man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or

Art. VIII. necessary to Salvation. And she will further tell us, That the Three *Creeds*, the *Nicene*, the *Athanasian*, and that commonly called the *Apostles Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain Warrants of holy Scripture. But when she speaks of her own Articles, she tells us, they were agreed upon, and designed for this end and purpose, viz. For the avoiding of diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion. It is a scandal therefore upon the Church of *England*,

to say, that she ever thought it lawful to add to the Apostles Creed ; or that it was in hers, or in the power of the Church of Rome, or of all the Churches in the World to make or coin any one new Article of Faith. Which if it be true, then will it be a very hard task indeed to justify Pope *Pius IV.* who hath added XII. new Articles, as necessary to be received and believed by all Men in order to their Salvation. To bring off this Prelate as well as he can, our Vindicator tells us, That these Articles were collected by him at that time in opposition to the then broach'd Errors of *Luther* and *Calvin*; that in so doing he is warranted by Primitive practices; and that the Articles do not contain any new Doctrine, but only a Declaration of that, to be the true and Orthodox Doctrine of the Church, which was really so antecedent to that Declaration. And therefore (saith he) We have now only to enquire, *Whether the Doctrine propos'd in the profession of Pius IV. be according to Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Fathers?* if it be not, they do well that reject it; but if it be, the noise of Additional Articles will be but a weak justification of those, that have made a breach in the Church on this score.

That these Articles were collected in opposition to some pretended Errors of *Luther* and *Calvin*, and that it was the practice of the Primitive Church, when any Error or Heresie was raised against any point of received Doctrine, to condemn the Error or Heresie and the Abettors of them, and to declare the opposed Doctrine to be Orthodox, is readily granted: But *Whether the Doctrine delivered in these Articles be new or old*, is the thing now in question. The Vindicator undertakes to prove that it is according to Scripture, and the Sense of the Primitive Fathers; which, if he do, then we must own our selves to blame; but if he fail in it, then, notwithstanding this his Vindication, he must, if he be ingenuous, acknowledge that we have just cause to withdraw from their Communion upon that score.

The Profession of Pope *Pius IV.*

I steadfastly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and other Observances and Constitutions of the Church.

IN this Article there are III. things which we are required to admit and embrace: I. Apostolical Traditions. II. Ecclesiastical Traditions. III. Other Observances and Constitutions of the Church.

The Additional Articles of Pope Pius's Creed,

As for the first of these, viz. *Traditions* truly *Apostolical*, and universally own'd for obligatory through all ages, we are ready with all due Veneration and profound Reverence to admit and embrace them. We are well assured that the Apostles were Men divinely inspired, and whatsoever Doctrine was delivered by them, or whatsoever Rules of practice they did prescribe to be perpetually observed in the Church, were no less than the Dictates of unerring Wisdom; and therefore to contravene or not comply with them, if they be sufficiently propounded to us, would be great impiety. But if we do not receive every thing as a Tradition truly Apostolical, which is pretended to be so, we ought to be excused by the Imposers. If we are told, as we have been by some of the Romish Writers, That the whole Canon, word by word, as it is now used in the Mass, came directly from the Apostles: Or, That the Apostles appointed their Orders of Monks: Or, That Christ was the Captain and Standard-bearer of Monastick life: Or, That private Mass, Half-Communion, Purgatory, Pardons, Indulgences, and I know not what else, are all from the Apostles: This will want a confirmation, and till we have it, we must beg leave to suspend our belief; and crave their pardon if we do not admit or embrace it as a Tradition truly Apostolical.

The next thing we are required to admit and embrace, are, *Ecclesiastical Traditions*. Now those are either such as have been universally received by the Church in all Ages; or are recommended to us by the present Church only. The former of these we have a very great regard and reverence for, are willing to admit and embrace them, and to give them the next place in our esteem to Scripture Tradition. But we cannot be so complaisant, nor so far comply with the Council of *Trent*, to receive them with equal affection and reverence. We think with *St. Aug.* *That it is no injury to St. Cyprian to distinguish his Writings from the Canonical Authority of the holy Scriptures.* And with the same holy Father, We think, *That the Judgment of St. Paul alone, is to be preferred before that of all the Fathers taken together.*

The latter of these, viz. *The Traditions of the present Church*, though we have a very great esteem and value for them, yet without a strict examination how far they agree with Scripture and Universal Tradition, we cannot so readily admit and embrace them. For as *St. Hieron* in his time said, so we say now, *Those things which Men invent of themselves, as it were by Apostolical Tradition, without the Authority and witness of the holy Scriptures, are confounded by God.*

The third thing we are here required to admit and embrace, are, *All other Observances and Constitutions of the same Church.* If by Church here, be mean the Catholique Church of all Ages, whatsoever is made appear to have been an Observance or Constitution thereof, we shall have a mighty regard for it; but how shall we know what the Observances and Constitutions of the Church have been, if they be not conveyed unto us by an uninterrupted and unquestionable Tradition? and if we do not know them, how can we admit or embrace them? But it is remarkable, That the Observances and Constitutions mentioned in this Article, are things different from what hath been delivered to us, either by Apostolical or Ecclesiastical Tradition; else, why are they called *other*? And it is as observable, That by Church here, he doth not mean the Church of all Ages, but the present Church only; not the Catholick, but the Roman Catholick Church, whose Observances and Constitutions we are required to admit and embrace; Otherwise, why doth he restrain it to the same Church? which word, *same*, the Vindicator hath thought fit to leave out.

Now there are many Observances and Constitutions in the Church of *Rome*, which we think she hath no authority to impose upon other Churches, nor have they any reason to admit and embrace.

But notwithstanding all this our Vindicator hath undertaken to prove, *That, not only this, but all the Articles in the Profession of Pope Pius IV. are according to Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Fathers.* How well he hath acquitted himself in this undertaking, I shall now examine; and observing his own method, shall consider his proofs of every Article severally.

He begins his proof of this Article by Scripture, and then fortifies it by the Testimony of the Fathers. His first Scripture proof is taken out of 2 *Thef.* 2. 15. Where St. Paul saith, *Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions, which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.* Here he observes, That there are two ways of delivering the sacred Truth, one by writing, the other by Word of Mouth; and that the Doctrine is to be held fast, whether it be delivered the one way, or the other. All which we readily grant him, provided, it be made appear, That the Tradition as it stands distinguished from the written Word, be Apostolical; or that what is so delivered be Truth; or a Doctrine agreeable to the written Word. For certainly St. Paul did not preach one thing and write another; and if he did not, then all that can be made of this Text, will amount only to this, Hold fast the self same substance of Religion and Doctrine, that I have taught you either by Word or Writing, *i. e.* either by

preaching unto you in person, when present; or instructing you by my Epistle, when at a distance. Thus *Nicephorus* understands it, telling us, That those things which *St. Paul* had plainly taught by preaching, when present; the same things, being absent, he was desirous to recal to their memories, by a compendious recapitulation of them in Writing. And the Annotator under *St. Hierom's* name, saith, *Quando sua vult teneri, non vult extranea superaddi*. And if thus we are to understand this place, it will do but little service for the support of Romish Traditions: Many, I wish I might not say, most of which are besides, if not against, the written word. But doth not *St. Chrysostome* understand this place of Scripture otherwise? the Vindicator thinks he doth, and therefore hath produced him as an evidence against us; Well, let us hear what he saith, *They* (the Apostles) *have not delivered all in their Epistles*. (who denies it?) *but many things also without writing*. (who doubts of it?) *which are likewise to be believed*, (yes, if we knew what they were;) But all things worthy of belief, and which ought to be believed when known, are not necessary, nor indeed possible to be believed, before they are known. Those many other things which *Jesus* did and were never written, of which *St. John* speaks, would all be worthy of belief, and ought to be believed, if they were known; but not being known, they are not necessary to be believed; nor are we obliged to believe any one, who tells us This or That was one of them, the Scripture being silent therein.

But *St. Chrysostome* adds, *Let us therefore esteem the Tradition of the Church worthy of Credit*. 'Tis a Tradition, enquire no farther. We grant the Tradition of the Church is worthy of Belief, and when any is made appear to be so, we will seek no farther. But then it must be the Tradition not of the present Church only, but of the Church in all Ages, and such a Tradition as from hand to hand, and Age to Age, brings us up to the times and persons of the Apostles, and our Saviour himself, and so is confirmed by all those Miracles and other arguments, whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true.

But I know none can better acquaint us with the mind and meaning of *St. Chrysostome*, than *St. Chrysostome* himself, who, in the same Homily out of which these words are taken, hath these other, *All those things that are in the holy Scriptures are right and clear, all that which is necessary, is therein clear and manifest*. And if so then those Traditions that are not in the Scripture, are unnecessary things. And the same Father, in another place tells us, *When we say any thing without the Scripture, the thoughts of the Hearers are uncertain*. The Traditions therefore which *St. Chrysostome* here speaks

speaks of, are such as are either contained in, or may be warranted by the written word, and if so, then he will stand the Vindicator in little stead.

His next Scripture Proof is taken out of 2 Tim. c. 2. v. 2. where St. Paul thus directeth Timothy, *The things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.* Whence he observes, That St. Paul takes care, that what he had taught the faithful, though only heard from him, might be observed, and conveyed down to Posterity, by their teaching of others. How well this Gloss doth agree with the Text, needs no other evidence, than comparing the one with the other. But if we would know St. Paul's design in these words, let us consider for what end he besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus, when he himself went into Macedonia, which he tells us was, That he might charge some to teach no other Doctrine, 1 Tim. 1. 3. i. e. None other but what he himself had delivered to the Ephesians; for there were certain false Apostles which did endeavour to draw the Ephesians to the observation of Legal Rites, and Jewish Traditions, as necessary to salvation, saith their own Lyra upon the place. The business therefore which Timothy had to do, as Governour of that Church, was, That none but only faithful and able men should be admitted by him to preach unto them. And this is that which St. Paul again charges him to do in this place; so their own Lyra upon the place informs us; for, saith he, St. Paul here stirs up Timothy to be solicitous in preaching himself, and to make choice of others who were fit for that work: and therefore he saith, *The things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses* (i. e. confirmed by the Law and the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, or other sacred Writings) *the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.* (i. e. to Men of a sound Faith, who shall be fit by the example of holy life, by their Knowledge and by their Eloquence to teach others also.) Now what relation this hath to Traditions, or why this Gentleman brought it in as a proof of them, I cannot devise.

These are all the Scripture proofs which he offers for Traditions, but he hath a Reserve of two passages out of two of the Fathers to make good the Reer.

The first of which, he tells us, is to be found in Epiphanius, Her. 61. in these words, 'Tis necessary to admit of Traditions, for all things cannot be found in Scripture; and therefore the holy Apostles delivered some things in writing, and some by Tradition. How far this will serve the end he aims at, is now to be considered. That in some cases it is necessary to admit of Traditions, was never denied by

by us; nor did we ever affirm, That all things are to be found in Scripture; nor do we deny, but that the Holy Apostles did deliver some things in Writing, and some by Tradition, *i. e.* by word of Mouth. But we deny that it is necessary to admit of Traditions, *i. e.* unwritten Traditions, in all cases; or indeed in any, unless it can be made appear that they have been universally received by the whole Church in all Ages. And we do affirm, that though the Scriptures do not contain all things, yet they do contain all things necessary to be believed by us in order to our Salvation. And though we do not deny, but that some things were delivered by the Apostles in Writing, and some by word of mouth; yet we do deny, that what was delivered by word of mouth was either besides or against what was written by them. What was delivered in writing hath been carefully preserved, we have it before our eyes, and are sure of it; but of those things which were delivered by word of mouth, some we are sure have been lost; as for instance, Those many other things which Jesus did, mentioned by St. *John c. 21. v. 25.* and the cause of the hinderance of the coming of Anti-Christ, mentioned by St. *Paul 2 Tb. 2.* That Records are a much more faithful keeper than Tradition, appears by these instances; those few that were written being still preserved and believed, and those infinity that were not written being all lost and vanished out of the memory of Men. And seeing God in his providence hath not thought fit to preserve the memory of them, he hath freed us from the obligation of believing them: for every obligation ceaseth, when it becomes impossible. You will not, you dare not say, that God would suffer any thing to be lost that was necessary to Salvation, nor can you deny but that he hath suffered these Traditions to be lost; and therefore the Knowledge or Belief of them, though it were a profitable thing, yet is it not necessary. And if so, then with what face can you require us to assent unto this Article upon pain of damnation; when we have no footsteps or print remaining, which with divine Faith we may rely upon? All which considered, may we not truly say, That *Epiphanius* here, if rightly understood, is neither for them, nor against us? For we say with him, that it is necessary to admit of Tradition in some, but not in all cases; We acknowledge also, that the Holy Apostles delivered some things in Writing, and some by Tradition; and when any thing is made appear to us to be of Apostolical Tradition, and delivered by them as necessary to Salvation, we will enquire no farther, but will readily admit and embrace it.

His next Authority is taken out of St. *Gregory Nyssen. l. 3. contra Eunom. p. 126.* where he tells us these words are to be found, 'Tis a
sufficient

sufficient proof of our Doctrine, that we have received it by Tradition from our Ancestors; it having been left us, as an Inheritance, by the Apostles; and convey'd down to us, by a continued Succession of the Faithful in all Ages.

I see nothing in all this, but what without any scruple we may readily assent to. Gregory Nyssen says, *It is a sufficient proof of our Doctrine, that we have received it by Tradition from our Ancestors.* And who these Ancestors were, he tells us in the next words; *It having been left us, as an Inheritance, by the Apostles:* So then the Ancestors here spoken of were the Apostles, and the Tradition here mentioned, was, what was left us, as an Inheritance, by them. Now what was it that was left us, as an Inheritance, by the Apostles, but only the Doctrine of Christianity contained in their Writings? which Doctrine hath been convey'd down to us by a succession of the Faithful in all Ages i. e. by Universal Tradition.

That this is the sense of this Father in this place, is plain from his own words, and is agreeable to the way and manner of speaking among the Fathers; by whom the Gospel it self, and the whole Religion of Christ is frequently called *A Tradition*. So the Articles of our Faith are by *Tertullian* called *An old Tradition*. So the Faith of the Holy Trinity in the Council of *Constantinople* is called *A Tradition*. And the Faith of two sundry Natures in Christ, in the same Council is called *The lively Tradition of the Apostles*. So *St. Basil* calls it *A Tradition*. To believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. And in this sense *St. Paul* calls the Apostolical Doctrine, *A Tradition*. This is all that he produceth in the behalf of Traditions. Now whether he hath hereby proved that the Romish Doctrine of Traditions is according to Scripture, and the Sense of the Primitive Fathers, I leave the Reader to judge.

His next Effort is to make good the latter part of this Article, touching all the other Observances and Constitutions of the Church. And here we might reasonably have expected, that he should have told us, what those Observances and Constitutions are, which we are required to admit and embrace. But that is not the way of the Church of *Rome*, she expects that her votaries should rely upon her guidance and conduct with an implicit Faith, and observe her Dictates with a blind Obedience. And therefore the Vindicator here like a dutiful Son of such a Mother, never stops to tell us what is required of us; but, without more ado, goes about to prove, That, whatsoever those Observances and Constitutions are, it is our duty to admit of them, and embrace them. And this he pretends to do both by an Apostolical Precept, and Apostolical Practice; Two
mighty

De præ-
scription.
advers.
Hæreticos.
Concil.
Constantinop. 6.
Act. 4.
Eadem
Actione.
Basil. de
Spiritu
Sancto.
2 Th. 2. 15.

mighty arguments, if they be apposite to the thing in hand, and well managed; which whether they be or no, I shall now examine.

The Apostolical Precept which he produceth, is in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, c. 13. v. 7, 17. in these words, *Remember them, which have the rule over you, &c. Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves; for they watch for your Souls, as they that must give an account, &c.* In the former of these Verses (as their own *Lyra* upon the place tells us) we are taught how to behave our selves towards our Spiritual Rulers that are dead: We ought to remember them, by following their Faith, and imitating their good Examples. And lest we should be at a loss to know who they are whom we are to remember, and whose Faith and Vertue we are to follow, the same *Lyra* tells us, They were the Apostles and other Disciples of Christ. In the latter place, the same *Lyra* tells us, we are taught how to behave our selves towards our Spiritual Rulers who are alive, viz. by obeying their Commands, and giving due Reverence to their Persons. That obedience is due from Inferiors to their Superiors, we readily grant. But then, I. They must be such Superiors as not only pretend to have, but really have a right to rule over them. Now we do not think, that any particular Church, no not the Church of *Rome* it self, hath any authority to give Laws to another Church; for it is a certain Rule, *Par in parem non habet imperium*, Equals have no power over one another. And if so, then the Church of *Rome* hath no reason to expect our compliance with every thing, which she thinks fit to require of us. II. As they ought to have a right to rule over us, so their commands ought to be such as we may without sin obey them; otherwise the rule of the Apostles will dispense with us, *Whether it be better to obey God or Man, judge ye.* Now whether they be so or no, how can we tell, if we are not allowed before-hand to know what they are? These things being thus premised, I dare now venture any unbiassed Reader to be the Judge, whether by virtue of this Precept the Church of *Rome* may justly challenge a power to impose what Observances and Constitutions she pleaseth upon the whole Christian World? For that is truly the question between us.

Having considered the Precept by him procured, and found him mistaken in it; Let us now consider his argument from Primitive Practice, and see whether that will stand him in any more stead. This he tells us, was the practice of the Apostles, even of *St. Paul* himself and *Silas*, who, as they went through the Cities, they delivered them the Decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles

Lyra in
Hebr. c.
13. v. 7.

Act. 4. 19.

Apostles and Elders, which were at *Jerusalem*. And so were the Churches established in the Faith, *Acts* xvi. 4, 5. The Apostolical Council held at *Jerusalem*, having finished their Decrees, commissioned *Paul* and *Barnabas*, with *Judas* and *Silas* to publish the same among the Brethren that were of the *Gentiles* in *Antioch*, and *Syria*, and *Cilicia*, *Acts* c. xv. v. 22, 23. These Men faithfully discharged their duty, in performing their Commission, and their so doing had a good effect; for thereby the Churches were established in the Faith, and increased in number daily. Now what is all this to the Vindicator's purpose? Will it necessarily follow, That because *Paul* and *Silas* published the Apostles Decrees in these places, Therefore the Church of *Rome* may impose what Ordinances and Constitutions she will upon all Christians? If not, I do not see what good this instance of Apostolical Practice will do the Vindicator.

I also admit the Holy Scripture according to that Sence, which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held, and does hold; to whom it belongs to judge of the true Sence and Interpretation thereof. Nor will I ever admit or interpret it otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers.

WHAT *Tertullian* said merrily of the Heathens in his time; *Unless God please Man well, He shall be no God,* (and so now *Tertul. in Apolog- Man must be friendly and favourable unto God*) may with a little variation be here applied to the Church of *Rome*, *Unless the Holy Scriptures please Her well, they shall be no Scriptures.* For unless they speak according to Her Sence, they are not to be admitted, it belonging to Her to judge of the true Sence and Interpretation of them. For I do not at all doubt but it is of that Church that this Article speaks, and which it stiles *Our Holy Mother, the Church*. And for this, I have the warrant of *Pope Pius* himself, who in his XXIII. Article stiles it, *The Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.* Nor indeed can it be otherwise understood, for if the true Sence of Scripture must depend upon the Judgment of the Universal Church, i. e. of all the Christians, or at least of all the Bishops and Pastors in the World; how is it possible to get them together to declare the Sence thereof? or must we reject all Scripture, till we have such a Declaration? If you tell me, that we must look for it in the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers. I answer, I. That this is an impossible task for all

all sorts of Christians; for Women and unlearned Men can never perform it: if therefore their Salvation depend thereupon, they must inevitably be damned. II. Those that are learned and able to read and understand the Fathers, do not find any such unanimous consent among them; so that if according to this Article we must not admit the Scripture, till they are all agreed about the Sence of it; both learned and unlearned will for ever want a Rule to govern themselves by, in the eternal concerns of their immortal Souls.

To avoid these difficulties, The Church of *Rome*, by *Catholick*, understands the *Roman* Catholick Church; and by *Our Holy Mother the Church*, the Church of *Rome*; which they call, *the Mother and Mistress of all Churches*. But will this make the business ever a jot the more easie? Must all the Christians in the World, out of *Greece*, *Egypt*, and many other more remote parts, repair to *Rome*, to receive the true Sence and Interpretation of the Scriptures? Or if they do, are they sure to meet with it, when they come there? Will they not find as much difference in opinions between the Doctors of that Church, as of any other? Will they not find, that Councils have contradicted Councils, and Popes condemned Popes? And if so, where then can they hope to meet with an infallible Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures? To this may be added, That if it belong to the Church to judge of the true Sence and Interpretation of Scripture, and we are not to admit of it but according to Her Sence; then it will be necessary to know which is the Church, and whether that which pretends to be so, be indeed the true Church; for without that we cannot with any certainty depend upon Her Judgment. But how shall we know that

Nulla modo cognoscitur quæ sit vera Ecclesia Christi, nisi tantummodo per Scripturas. *Chrysostom. in opere imperfecto. Hom.*
49.

Ecclesiam Christi sicut ipsum Caput Christum, in Scripturis Sanctis Canonicis debemus agnoscere. *Aug. de Unitat. Eccl. c. 66.*

but by the Scriptures? *St. Chrysostome* saith, *It is impossible to know it otherwise.* And *St. Augustine*, for the discovery of the true Church, directs us to the sacred Scriptures. And indeed, how is it possible to know this or that to be a *True Church*, i. e. of a sound Judgment, and

pure in the Faith; unless we first know the Rule of Faith, which is the Word of God? But how shall we know either the one or the other, but by making use of our own Reason, and judging for ourselves of those Evidences which are produced? So that in fine, If we should grant all that the Church of *Rome* requires of us, yet must we make use of our own Reason to understand that Sence and Interpretation which she gives us of the Holy Scriptures. Which is no more, nor less, than resolving all at last into a private Judgment.

ment. And that all Christians not only may, but ought, in this manner, and in these cases, thus to judge for themselves, we have good warrant and Authority from the Word of God; in which we are advised, *Not to believe every Spirit, but to try the Spirits whether they be of God; because many false Prophets are gone out into the World,* 1 John iv. 1. *And to prove all things, but to hold fast that which is good,* 1 Th. v. 21. *And to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us,* 1 Pet. iii. 15. And our Saviour tells us, *If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch,* Matth. xv. 14. And he severely reproveth those who did not receive his Doctrine, saying, *And why even of your selves judge ye not what is right?* Luke xij. 57. But notwithstanding all this, and much more, which hath been told them oftentimes over and over; yet the Vindicator like a stout Champion of his Church, undertakes to prove, *That this Article and every Branch of it, is according to Scripture, and the Sence of the Primitive Fathers.* Let us see now, how he acquits himself in this undertaking. This, he tells us, is founded upon the Doctrine delivered by St. Peter, 2 Ep. i. 20. *No Prophecy of the Scripture is of any private Interpretation.* From whence he thus argues, And if it be not of private Interpretation, private persons must apply themselves for the true Sence of it to some others; and to whom, but unto those whom God hath put over them; whom he hath commanded them to hear, to submit to and obey? &c.

When Men, by their own diligence and industry, cannot attain to the true sence and meaning of Holy Scripture, or after all their care and pains in the use of all proper means, are not satisfied therein; that in such a case they should apply themselves to those whom God hath set over them, as their Spiritual Guides, we think to be a method, not only safe and reasonable, but very necessary. But whether this be deducible from, or can be built upon this Text of Scripture, I take to be very questionable; or rather that it is out of question, that it cannot. And therefore before we proceed any farther, let us make a stand a while, and take a view of the Apostle's design in this place, and of the full and genuine importance of these words. St. Peter having faithfully discharged his duty in preaching the Gospel, and now finding the time of his departure hence near at hand, he commits to writing the substance of what he had preached, that so those to whom he had preached might always have it in remembrance; so little did he rely upon Tradition. That this was his design appears plainly from the 12, 13, 14, and 15 Verses of this Chapter. And that he might not burthen their memories too much, he gives them a short Summary of what

The Additional Articles in Pope Pius's Creed,

he had preached unto them, *viz.* The power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, v. 16. And to assure them of the truth and certainty thereof, he lays before them two undeniable Arguments ; I. A voice from Heaven, saying, *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* This was at his Transfiguration in the Mount, at which time Peter, James and John were with him, and were Eye-Witnesses of his Majesty, and Ear-Witnesses of that Heavenly Voice, *vers.* 16, 17, 18. II. But lest they should distrust them, or look upon this as an illusion, or a dream and fancy of their own ; he furnisheth them with another Argument, which he was well assured would not be rejected by them ; and that is taken from the Prophetical Writings, for which those of the Dispersion, *viz.* the converted Jews had a mighty regard ; saying, *We have also a more sure word of Prophecy, wherein ye do well that ye take heed, &c.* v. 19. meaning that Prophecy of holy David, Ps. ij. 7. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* And then he adds, *Knowing this first, that no Prophecy of the Scriptures (i. e. no Prophecy contained in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, to distinguish it from the dreams of those Men, who pretended to prophesie, but had neither Mission nor Commission from God so to do) is of any private Interpretation, (i. e. proceeds from any private or uninspired person, or is an invention of Man.)* And that this is the full importance of this Expression, the Apostle himself seems plainly to intimate in the very next words, where he saith, *For the Prophecy came not in old time by the Will of Man ; (i. e. The Prophets of old did not prophesie either what they pleased, or when they pleased) but holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. (i. e. they published nothing but what was dictated to them by the Holy Ghost, nor at any time but when they were moved by him)* v. 21. And if we consult the Original words, they cannot well be construed otherwise ; for what in the 20 verse is rendred, *Of any private Interpretation*, in the Greek is, *ἰδίαις ἐκλύσεις ἢ γίνεται*, and may be rendred thus, *All Prophecy of the Scripture is not made of their own Explication ;* which is the same which the Apostle afterwards saith, *That the Prophecy came not in old time by the Will of Man.* And for this sence of the Words, if that will weigh any thing with them, we have the Authority of their own *Lyra* upon the place. Now, if this be, as undoubtedly it is, the sence of the Apostle here ; let us see what consequence the Vindicator can draw from hence to favour his undertaking. The Apostle here assures those to whom he wrote, *That all Prophecy of Scripture is not made of their own Explication, i. e. (as he explains himself) Prophecy of old came not by the Will of Man.* Therefore (saith the Vindicator)

πᾶσα οὖν
προφητεία
γὰρ οὕτως.

it belongs to the Church (i. e. the Church of Rome) and her only, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture for all Christians. If you can swallow this consequence, I do not see what you need to stick at. One would have thought, the more natural consequence had been this, *Therefore trust not every thing that pretends to come from a Prophetical and infallible Spirit, but try whether it do so, or no.*

Thus you see what a firm foundation this Gentleman hath laid; which thus failing him, his Superstructure thereupon, must needs be in a very tottering condition.

His next Scripture is *Acts xx. 28.* Where St. Paul charges the Elders of *Ephesus*, *To take heed to themselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he had purchased with his own blood.* To these St. Paul saith, he had declared all the Counsel of God, *v. 27.* and then bids them *to take heed to the flock, &c. i. e.* to instruct those committed to their charge in that Doctrine which they had learned of him. That by a parity of reason, all Pastors and Teachers are to feed the flock committed to their care, we willingly grant; but how he will hence infer, That all Christian People are to receive the true sense and Interpretation of Scripture from the Church of Rome, I cannot imagine.

His next is, *1 Tim. III. 15.* Where St. Paul directs *Timothy*, how to behave himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the Truth. There is an excellent Treatise lately printed at London, intituled, *The Pillar and Ground of Truth*, to which (if this Gentleman be permitted to read it) I would refer him, for his better understanding of this Text.

His next is, *Matth. xxviii. 20.* Where our Saviour having given his Apostles his last and largest Commission, promiseth, *to be with them alway even unto the end of the World.* This promise was made to the Apostles, and not only to them, but to the whole Church of God in all Ages; but how the Church of Rome comes to claim a Title to this promise, more than any other, I know not; or if she had it, I do not see what service it would do her in this case; For, that Christ will be alway with his Church, so to preserve it as it shall never cease to be a Church, we do not doubt; but to preserve it from all error, as he never promised it, so we have no reason to expect it.

His next is, *John xvi. 13.* Where our Saviour tells his Disciples, *When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth.* This promise was not made to the whole Church, but to the Apostles; whose case was so peculiar and extraordinary, that the Church now hath no ground upon which to hope for the same Assistance which they

they then had, and which indeed was then necessary for them to have. That Christ will assist his Church in all Ages by his Grace, we do not deny; but that that Assistance implies Infallibility, we cannot grant; for then every private Christian, who is assisted by Divine Grace, would be infallible: But if it did, why the Church of Rome should put in a peculiar claim to this privilege, more than the Church of England, or any other particular Church, I see no reason. But it seems the Vindicator found great reason for it; for thus he argues, *Christ promised his Apostles, when he, the Spirit of truth, came, he should guide them into all truth. Therefore it belongs to the Church of Rome, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture.* Just as if one should argue, *Christ promised that these signs should follow them that believe, In his name they should cast out Devils, They should speak with new Tongues, They should take up Serpents, and if they drank any deadly thing it should not hurt them; They should lay hands on the sick, and they should recover, Mark c. xvi. v. 17, 18. Therefore all that believe in Christ at this day shall do the same things.*

His last Scripture proof is, *Matth. xviii. 17.* Where our Saviour saith, *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen man, and a Publican.*

To this I answer, I. That our Saviour in this place doth not speak of Controversies in Religion, or points of Faith; but of quarrels between neighbours; as is plain from v. 15. where our Saviour saith, *If thy Brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone, &c.* II. By Church here, we cannot understand either the Catholick, or that which they call the Roman Catholick Church. Not the former, for that would make the thing not only impracticable, but altogether impossible; for when a quarrel happens to arise between two Neighbours, if they must stay for the Decision of it, till the Universal Church is assembled for that purpose, their quarrel may last long enough. Nor the latter; for that would be as impracticable as the former; for if two Christians have a quarrel in Syria, or in Ethiopia, must they go to the Roman Church to end their difference? III. By the word, Church, therefore in this place, we must understand any particular Church, or Society of Christians, of which the two quarrelling Neighbours are Members. Now it is confessed on all hands, that any such Society, in giving Admonitions, and using of Censures, may err; being subject to be mislead either by passion, or prejudice, or ignorance. 'Tis plain therefore that this Scripture is not at all to his purpose, or if it were, it would do him no service.

Thus have I considered his Scripture proofs, and now let us see what the Fathers will say for him. He produceth two passages, both out

out of one and the same Father, viz. St. Aug. His first Authority is taken out of his first Book, *contra Crescon. Gram. c. 33.* Then, says he, we follow the truth of the Scriptures, when we do that, which hath seemed good to the whole Church, which Church is commended to us by the Authority of the Scripture; To the end that because Holy Writ cannot deceive, whosoever is afraid of being deceived by the difficulty of this question, may consult the Church concerning it; which without leaving room to doubt, the holy Scripture demonstrates. I cannot imagine what was in this Gentlemans mind, when he pickt up this passage of St. Aug. for a proof of this Article. St. Austin indeed says, *Then we follow the truth of the Scriptures, when we do that, which has seem'd good to the whole Church.* And who denies it? We have too great a Veneration for the Doctrine and Practice of the Universal Church, to suspect that there can be any ill in them; let but any thing be made appear to have been universally received, or universally practised by the Church in all Ages, and we will readily admit and embrace it, we will acquiesce in it, and seek no farther. Thus far do we perfectly agree with this holy Father, nor do we dissent from him in the rest. Which Church, says he, is commended to us by the Authority of the Scriptures. Well then, by his Rule we must understand the Scriptures before we can know the Church. Now the Scriptures, they themselves confess, do not consist in the Letters and Words, but in the Sence and meaning: And if so, then we must understand the sence and meaning of Scriptures antecedent to the Churches Interpretation of them. But he goes on, *To the end, says he, that because Holy Writ cannot deceive, whosoever is afraid of being deceived by the difficulty of this question, may consult the Church concerning it; which, without leaving room to doubt, the holy Scripture demonstrates.* And here I cannot but remark, I. That, according to St. Austin, Holy Writ is the only infallible rule to judge by, for it cannot deceive. II. That by this rule we are to find out the true Church, for, without any ambiguity, or leaving room to doubt, it plainly demonstrates it to us. III. That having by this means found out the true Church, we ought, in all questions which are too hard and difficult for us, to consult her about them. All which we readily agree to. Now let the Vindicator once more put on his spectacles, and seriously review this place of St. Austin, and I dare appeal to himself, or any man of sence, whether it do not directly conclude against this Article, which he undertakes to prove by it.

But perhaps he may have better luck with his next Authority, let us therefore consider that too; which he cites out of the same Father, *de Unitat. Eccles. c. 19.* whence he quotes these words; *If we had any wise man, whose Authority was recommended to us by Christ himself; we could no ways doubt of following his judgment, having consulted him upon this point;*
left

The Additional Articles in Pope Pius's Creed,

lest in refusing, we should not so much seem obstinately to withstand him, as Jesus Christ our Lord, by whose testimony he was recommended to us. Who doubts of all this? If it had pleased our Blessed Saviour to have given such testimony to the Church of Rome, or any other Church, we should never have doubted to follow the judgment of that Church; and when they can make it appear that he hath done so, we shall, without any the least scruple, submit to it. But St. Austin goes on, Christ hath given testimony of his Church, (True, but where? is it not in the holy Scriptures? and if so, then we must understand them, before we can be satisfied concerning this Testimony) and as this Church directs, you ought with all readiness obey. (Right, but first we must know which is this Church, and that according to St. Austin we cannot do, but by the Scriptures.) And if you will not, 'tis not to me you are disobedient, or any man; but most perversely to the prejudice of your own Soul, you withstand Christ himself, because you refuse to follow the Church, which is recommended by his Authority, whom you judge it a wickedness to resist. All this we can readily subscribe to, for when by the Holy Scripture, we have once found out which is the true Church, we ought with all readiness to yield obedience thereunto; because it is recommended to us by the Authority of Jesus Christ, whom to resist in any thing, we account a great wickedness. But where shall we meet with this Authoritative Recommendation, except in the holy Scriptures? So that still we must understand the Scriptures, before we can know which is that Church, that is recommended to us by Christ. And now, pray'e, what is all this to the proof of this Article; That it belongs to the Church to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture, and that we are not to admit Scripture to be Scripture, but according to that sense, which she gives of it. And yet, all this while, we cannot, according to St. Austin, know the Church, but by the Scripture.

I do also profess that there are truly and properly seven Sacraments of the new Law, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and necessary for the salvation of Mankind; though all be not necessary for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extream Unction, Order, and Matrimony; that they conferr Grace, and that three of them, Baptism, Confirmation and Order, cannot be reiterated without Sacrilege.

HERE the Vindicator tells us, That the holy Scripture no where assigns the number of the Sacraments, either of their being two
or

or seven. Neither doth it give us the definition of a Sacrament, and the word is not so much as named in the English Translation, and only once in the Vulgar, viz. *Ephes. v. 32.* speaking of Matrimony. All that we believe therefore in this point, we receive from the Church, as it hath been delivered, founded upon the Doctrine of the Fathers, and the Sense of the Scripture. To this I answer, That it is not more plain that in Scripture there is no mention of Sacraments, than that in the Fathers there is no mention of seven. The determination of the number is of so late a date, that their ingenuous *Cassander* freely confesses, *That it is not easie to find any man before Peter Lombard (who lived in the twelfth Century) which hath set down any certain and definite number of Sacraments.* The Council of *Florence* indeed insinuates this number of seven Sacraments, as *Suarez* contends. But it was never determined till the late Council of *Trent* in the last Age; and therefore must needs be a great Novelty. But to vindicate the Doctrine of seven Sacraments, as it is now taught in the Church of *Rome*, and summ'd up in this Article, from the imputation of Novelty; This Gentleman undertakes to prove, that it is founded upon the Doctrine of the Fathers, and the sense of the Scripture; wherein, how well he acquits himself, we shall now consider. But because he tells us, that the Holy Scripture gives us no definition of a Sacrament, It will be necessary to state the notion of the thing, and to agree what it is, before we dispute how many of them there be. To the constitution of a Sacrament properly so called, we say that these three things must of necessity concur, viz. the word of Institution, a visible Sign, or outward Element; and a promise of invisible Grace annexed thereto. Which is the same that *St. Austin* saith, *Accedat verbum ad Elementum, & fit Sacramentum.*

Cassand.
Consult.
Art. 13. de
numero
Sacram.
An. 1439.
An. 1546.

And now let us see, how far they agree with us in this notion of a Sacrament. The *Trent Catechism*, which always speaks the sense of that Council, gives us this definition of a Sacrament, *It is a visible Sign of invisible Grace, instituted for our Justification,* which it grounds upon the Authority of *St. Austin*, and the compliance of all the School Doctors with him therein.

Aug. in
Joan.
Tract. 80.

The *Doway Catechism* saith, * *A Sacrament is a visible sign of invisible Grace, instituted by Christ our Lord, for our Sanctification.*

Catech. ad
Parochos
pars 2.
Tit. de
Sacram.
n. 5. p. 113.
Aug. l. 10.
de civ. Dei.

And their † *Summ of Christian Doctrine*, &c. printed at London, 1686. saith, *A Sacrament is a visible Sign instituted by Jesus Christ, to convey his Grace into our Souls, and to apply unto us the merits of his death.*

c. 5. And
Epist. 2.
** P. 49.*
† P. 4. 5.

So then it is agreed between us, that these three things, viz. The word of Institution, a visible Sign, and a promise of invisible Grace, are absolutely necessary to make and constitute a Sacrament. And it

is acknowledged on all hands, that these three are to be found in the Sacrament of Baptism and the Lords Supper. The dispute therefore between us is, concerning the Five additional Sacraments of the Church of *Rome*. Of which we say, That they want either the Word, or the Element, or both. *Marimony, Order, and Penance*, have the word of God, but they have no outward Element; *Extream Unction*, and *Confirmation* have neither Word nor Element. But this Gentleman contends, That these Five, as well as the other Two, are founded upon the Doctrine of the Fathers, and the Sence of the Scripture. And here, I confess, the Vindicator hath taken a great deal of pains, but to little purpose; he hath sweat and toil'd, and at last found out a great many Fathers, who have called them Sacraments; which is a thing that no body would have deny'd him upon his own bare word. For, That many things, which indeed, and by special property, are no Sacraments, may nevertheless pass under the general name of a Sacrament; he must be a very great stranger to the Writings of the Fathers, who will not acknowledge it. We very well know that it was usual with the Fathers, to call any sacred Sign, or Mystery in Religion, or any holy significant Rite, by the name of a Sacrament. And in this Sence he might reckon not only seven, but seventy, or more if he pleased, for he may furnish himself with great variety. *Tertulian* calls the Stick which *Elisba* cut down, cast into the water, and made the Iron swim, *Sacramentum Ligni*, the Sacrament of Wood. And the same Father calls the whole State of the Christian Faith, *Religionis Christiana Sacramentum*, The Sacrament of the Christian Religion. And *St. Austin* speaks of the Sacrament of the Cross. And *Leo* calls the Cross of Christ both a Sacrament and an Example. And *St. Jerome* calls the Water and Blood which issued out of the side of the blessed Jesus, the Sacraments of Baptism and Martyrdom. And *Leo* calls the vow of Virginity, a Sacrament. And *St. Austin* calls the Bread that was given unto the Novices or Beginners in the Faith called *Catechumens*, before they were baptized; a Sacrament. And if he will but consult *St. Hilary* he may find in him these expressions, The Sacrament of Prayer, the Sacrament of Hunger, the Sacrament of the Scriptures, The Sacrament of Weeping, and the Sacrament of Thirst. And *St. Bernard* calls our Saviour's washing of the Disciples Feet, the Sacrament of daily sins. I suppose he will not call all these Sacraments of the new Law instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; and if not, then must he acknowledge, that there are Sacraments to be found in the Fathers, besides those

Tertul. advers. Judæos.

Contr. Marcion. l. 4. Aug. in Sermonibus de Sanctis 19.

Leo de Resurrect. Domini, Serm. 2.

Hieron. ad Occasionem.

Inter Decreta Leonis, c. 14.

Aug. de peccat. meritis & remiss. l. 2.

Hilar. in Matth. Cap. non. 11, 12, 23.

Bern. in Sermonibus de Coena Domini.

those that are properly so called. The truth is, the Fathers sometimes spake Metaphorically, and sometimes properly; sometimes they spake more loosely, and sometimes more closely; sometimes they spake of things as they were in themselves, and by specially property such, and sometime by way of allusion, and as in a general sence they might be called such. And if we be not careful to difference these severall ways and manners of speech in the reading of them, we may unawares fall into great errors and mistakes. This is plain in the matter now before us. All are not Sacraments properly so called, which they call so; we are therefore to distinguish between their expressions when they speak of a thing *obiter*, and by the bye, and when they treat of it designedly and on set purpose. And if we consider their Writings, when in the latter way they treat of this subject, we shall find that they mention no more Sacraments but only two. St. Cyprian saith, *Then may they be thoroughly sanctified, and become the Children of God, if they be new-born by both the Sacraments.* And St. Austin saith, *Our Lord and his Apostles have delivered unto us a few Sacraments instead of many, and the same in doing most easie, in signification most excellent, in observation most reverend, as is the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Celebration of the Body and Blood of our Lord.* And again the same holy Father speaking of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, saith, *These be the two Sacraments of the Church.* And Paschasius saith, *These be the Sacraments of Christ in the Catholick Church, Baptism and the Body and Blood of our Lord.* And Cardinal Bessarion saith, *We read, that these only two Sacraments were delivered us plainly in the Gospel.* Here you have Both the Sacraments, and the Two Sacraments, and the Only Two Sacraments of the Church. Whence it is plain, that though the Fathers sometimes, either in heat of this discourse, or for a Rhetorical flourish, might call those Sacraments, which properly speaking, were not so; yet when they did designedly and on set purpose speak of them, they mentioned only Two, which, I think, may be a sufficient answer to his Authorities. But he has yet another Reserve to bring up, and that is, That all these are founded upon the sence of the Scripture. Let us see now, whether this will any more avail him, than the Authority of the Fathers hath done.

Cypr. 1. 2. Ep. 1.
ad Steph.

Aug. de Doctrina
Christiana l. 3. c. 9.

Aug. de Symbolo
ad Catechumenos.
Paschasius de Coe-
na Domini.

Bessarion de Sacra-
ment. Eucharistia.

Of the pretended Sacrament of Confirmation.

TO establish this, he produceth *Acts viij. 17, 18.* where it is said, *Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the Apostles hands, the*

Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money. Here we have a narrative of matter of Fact, but nothing that looks like a Sacrament in it; for, here is neither any word of Institution, nor any outward Element; which are things agreed to be absolutely necessary to the making or constituting of a Sacrament. Here is no mention of Christ, or Unction, or of the blow on the Ear, or of the Head-band, which are look'd upon as things necessary, and of the Essence of the pretended Popish Sacrament of Confirmation. Besides, the Imposition of hands by the Apostles in this place, was not to celebrate a Sacrament to perfect or strengthen Baptism, but to conferr miraculous and extraordinary gifts, *i. e.* to give the Holy Ghost. This *Simon Magus* saw, and therefore offered money for that gift, which he would never have done for Popish Confirmation. To this I may add the testimony of their own *Alexander de Hales*, who saith, *The Sacrament of Confirmation, as it is a Sacrament, was neither instituted by our Lord himself, nor by his Apostles, but was afterwards instituted in the Council of Melda.* So that though this may be an ancient Rite, it can be but a new Sacrament, *i. e.* no Sacrament.

Alex. Ha-
les. part 4.
qu. 24.
memb. 1.

Of the pretended Sacrament of Penance.

TO prove this, he produceth, *John xx. 22.* ¹⁰ Where it is said, *He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, and v. 23. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.*

Before I give a direct answer hereunto, let me premise; That the difference between us and the Church of Rome in this point is not, Whether Penance be necessary to Salvation, or whether men ought to confess their sins, amend their lives, and turn unto God by true Repentance; but whether this Penance be a Sacrament, wherein a contrite sinner ought punctually to confess his sins to a Priest, and from him to receive judicial Absolution, upon condition to make satisfaction unto God by Corporal or Pecuniary Penance, which whosoever doth not accomplish in this life, shall suffer for it in Purgatory?

The former of these we willingly assent to, as being founded on the Word of God; but the latter we reject, as having no foundation either in this, or any other Text of Scripture.

That our Saviour here doth commit to his Church the power of the Keyes *i. e.* of publick Discipline, by virtue whereof she hath Authority to admit into, or cast out of the Church, such as she shall judge worthy of it; we readily grant, and do heartily bewail the want of it. But that it is of such absolute necessity, that the truly penitent

penitent sinner cannot receive Pardon of sins without it, we cannot subscribe to. And this is all that their own *Lyra* can find in these words. *Lyra in loc.*

But the Vindicator, in compliance with the Council of Trent; (which teacheth, *That those who fall from Grace after Baptism, have need of another Sacrament to restore them, and therefore our Saviour instituted this of Penance, and Anathematizeth all those who deny this Doctrine*) hath found out a Sacrament in these words: But if our Saviour did by these words Institute a Sacrament, I would fain know, which is the Element or Visible Sign Instituted by Christ; for this, on both sides, is acknowledged to be a necessary part of a Sacrament. According to the Church of Rome, this Sacrament consists of Four Parts, viz. Contrition, Confession, Absolution, and Satisfaction. Contrition of the Heart can be no sensible nor visible Sign. Nor can Confession pretend to it; for, 1. Confession is so far from being a Sign of the Grace of God, that it is a declaration that we are unworthy of his Grace. 2. It is designed not to signify the Grace of God, but to ask it. 3. The sacred Signs ought to be administered by the Priest, but Confession is made by the Penitent. Nor can Absolution lay any claim to it; for, 1. Absolution, if it be good and available, is the Grace of God, and therefore cannot be a Sign of it. 2. If it could be a Sign, yet can it not be a Visible Sign, for the words are not Visible. Nor can Satisfaction pretend to it, for that is accomplished by the Sinner, and not administered by the Priest. So that in all these we can find no outward Element, or Visible Sign of Invisible Grace, Instituted by Christ; and without that it cannot be a Sacrament.

There is one thing yet which may make some colourable pretence to it, and that is, The Imposition of the Priest's Hands. This we confess is a Visible Sign: But, 1. It is no Element, but an Action; as the distribution of the Bread in the Lord's Supper is not the Element, but the Bread sanctified. 2. This Imposition of Hands is not of Christ's Ordination or Institution, and therefore cannot be a Sacramental Sign: He did never command, That the Priest should lay his Hands on any one to confer Sacramental Absolution. If he did, let them produce the command.

But if we review these words, we shall find, that they were spoken to the Apostles after that Christ was risen again from the Dead. And if so, then Repentance preached before, whether by the Prophets, or by St. John Baptist, or by Christ himself, was no Sacrament; nor that preached by St. Peter after the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, because the persons to whom he preached were not then Baptized. For thus the Council of Trent hath determined the point: Repentance was not a Sacrament

Concil.
Trid. Sess.
14. cap. 1.
& Can. 1.

Matth. iij.
Mark i.
15.
Acts ij. 38.
Concil.
Trid. Sess.
14. c. 1.

Sacrament before the coming of Christ, nor after his coming, is so to any one before Baptism.

And yet all good Christians in the Primitive and purest Times of the Church, for many hundred Years after Christ, never knew, nor dream'd of any other Penance, than what had been preached either by the Prophets, or by St. John Baptist, or by Christ himself, or by his Apostles; nor ever doubted of obtaining Pardon thereby. The truth is, till the Council of *Lateran*, we do not find, that ever Penance, as it is now used in the Church of *Rome*, was determined to be of necessary Observance. Nor till the Council of *Trent*, that it was required to be received as a Sacrament of divine Institution, and absolutely necessary to Salvation.

All which considered, notwithstanding this Gentleman's Vindication, I think we may safely conclude, That though Repentance be an old Duty, yet it is but a new Sacrament; and that Penance, as it is now used in the Church of *Rome*, is neither a Duty nor a Sacrament.

Of the pretended Sacrament of Extream Unction.

TO prove this, he produceth *James v. 14, 15.* where it is said, *Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oil, in the Name of the Lord: And the prayer of Faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.*

This place of Scripture hath been often enough brought upon the stage by one or other of the *Roman* party; and as often considered, and the Arguments drawn from it baffled by some of our Men. And therefore when I met with it here, I did expect that this Gentleman, who is so brisk at a Vindication, had found some new Matter in it, and thereby cut us out some new Work; but instead of that, he only quotes the place, transcribes the words, and leaves them to shift for themselves.

What therefore is here to be done by us, save only to consider the design of the Apostle in these Words? Which is plainly this; St. *James* directs the sick person, to call for the Elders of the Church, to assist him in that condition. The means by which they were to assist him are Two, 1. They were to pray over him. And, 2. To anoint him with Oil, in the Name of the Lord. And that in order to Two ends, 1. The Recovery of the Sick, 2. The Remission of Sins. Of these Means and Ends, the one is Perpetual, viz. Prayer and Remission of Sins; the other Temporary, viz. The Anointing with Oil, and the Recovery of bodily Health. That the Apostles had the Gift of Heal-

ing,

ing, we grant; and that in order to the working of their miraculous Cures, they did use the Ceremony of Anointing with Oil, we deny not; but the Gift of Healing being now ceased in the Church, that Ceremony is become useless and unprofitable, and for that reason laid aside; for God loves no unprofitable Signs. Whilst it was in use, it was used only in Order to bodily health; but now, in the Church of Rome, it is not to be used whilst there are any hopes of Recovery, but only in *Articulo mortis*, when Men are at the point of Death, as a *viaticum* into the other World.

That this was design'd and used only in order to bodily health, is plain from the Ancient Rituals of the Roman Church, for above Eight hundred Years after Christ. And Cardinal Cajetan freely confesseth, *Annot. in loc.* that this was the only use of it, for saith he, *These words of St. James speak not of the Sacramental Unction of Extreme Unction, whether we consider the words or the Effects of them; but rather of the Unction, which the Lord Jesus ordained in the Gospel, to be used by his Disciples to the Sick. For the Text saith not, Is any sick to Death? but absolutely, Is any sick? Nor doth it assign any other use of anointing of the sick person, but only the recovery of bodily health.* And the Ingenious Cassander, without any *Cassand. in Consult.* hesitation, freely delivers his Opinion, saying, *It is no Sacrament properly so called, because it hath neither Word of Institution, nor outward Element.* *Art. 22.*

The eldest Evidence that we meet with for this pretended Popish Sacrament of *Extreme Unction* is, the Council of Chalons, which was *Anno. 813,* held above Eight hundred Years after Christ; and was but at best a National Synod neither. So that though we do not deny, but that Anointing the Sick with Oil, was a very Ancient Rite; yet we cannot but look upon it as a very New Sacrament, and one that was never advanc'd to that honour by any Appointment of our blessed Saviour.

Of the pretended Sacrament of Orders.

To evince this, he produceth 2 Tim. i. 6. where St. Paul saith, *I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the Gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on of my Hands.*

St. Paul here admonisheth his Son Timothy to a vigorous exercise of that Power and Authority, which, by the Imposition of his Hands, he had received, to Preach the Gospel. And this is all that their *Lyra in loc.* own *Lyra* can find in this place.

But the Question between us is not, Whether the Office of a Priest ought to be conferred upon him by the Imposition of Hands; but whether

then such Ordination be a Sacrament of the new Law, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ. To this I answer, That if by the word, *Sacrament*, they only mean any sacred Sign, or Mystery, in Religion, (in which sense it is frequently used, especially by the Latine Fathers) we can very willingly and readily admit this Imposition of hands to be called a Sacrament. But if they would advance it higher, and have it called a Sacrament in the same sense, as Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are; or as this Article requires, That we should receive it as a Sacrament of the New Law, instituted by Jesus Christ, and necessary for the Salvation of Mankind; we cannot in this consent with them, and that for these Reasons: I. Because Imposition of hands, though it be a Sign, yet it is not a sacred Sign of the Covenant of God in Jesus Christ. II. Because it is not common to all the Faithful, but confined to a certain order of Men only. III. Because there is no express Institution of it to be found in the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, and consequently no promise of Grace annexed to it. IV. Because it is well known, that many of the Roman Communion, do not think Imposition of hands to be Essential to Holy Orders, and if not, then can it be no outward Sign of a Sacrament in them: Nor can Ordination it self be a Sacrament, seeing there is no outward visible Sign of it ordained by God. For these Reasons, Though we acknowledge the Conferring of Orders by Imposition of hands, to have been a very ancient usage in the Church, and of Apostolical practice; yet we think it to be a very new, i. e. no Sacrament.

Of the pretended Sacrament of Matrimony.

AS an evidence of this, he produceth Eph. v. 31, 32. where St. Paul saith, *For this cause shall a man leave his Father and Mother, and shall be joined to his Wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and his Church.*

The Church of Rome calls the marriage of Priests, Sacrilege; and yet will have the Marriage of Lay-men to be a Sacrament, which confers justifying Grace. And to prove this the Vindicator alledgeth this Text of Scripture, as many others before him have done, and have received their answer; but as if there had been no such thing, this Gentleman with sufficient confidence, barely cites it, and so leaves it.

To which however I shall return this answer, The Apostle in this place (as is plain to every considerate Reader) speaketh of the sacred Union between Jesus Christ and his Church; which Union he illustrates by that of Marriage between the Husband and the Wife. His

intent was not to exalt the Mystery of Marriage, but the Union of the Church with Jesus Christ. This Mystery then whereof he speaketh, is the Mystical Union between Jesus Christ and his Church, and not the Union between the Husband and the Wife. For having said, *This is a great Mystery*, that we might not think that he spake of the Mystery of Marriage, he addeth, *But I speak concerning Jesus Christ and his Church.*

But the Vulgar Translation of this Text calls it, *a Sacrament*; we grant it, but doth this prove Marriage to be a Sacrament? Will the Vindicator own all those things, which in the Vulgar Translation are called Sacraments, to be Sacraments of the Church of Rome? Then the great Whore mentioned in the *Revelations*, must be one of their Sacraments, for so the Vulgar Translation calls her, *Rev. xvij. 7.* And the seven Stars, mentioned *Rev. i. 20.* must be another, for so they are there called. And Dreams and Visions must be a third, for so they are three times called, *Dan. ij. 18, 30, 47.* And Piety is called a great Sacrament, *1 Tim. iij. 16.* I suppose he will not own these to be Sacraments of the Church of Rome, and yet in their Authentick Translation, they are called Sacraments, as well as Marriage.

But that Marriage is no Sacrament of the New Law, instituted by Jesus Christ; among many others, we have these reasons to satisfy our selves: I. Because it was not instituted by Jesus Christ, for it was in the World before his time. If after his coming, the blessed Jesus did change the nature of it, and make it a Sacrament, then let them shew us when and where he did it. II. Because, as it hath no word of Institution, so neither hath it any visible Sign or outward Element; for neither the words, nor the actions are Elements; and unless there be an Element, to which the word of Institution is joined, it can be no Sacrament. III. Because there is no promise of Grace annexed to any outward Element; for, though the state of Matrimony be a sign of that Mystical Union between Christ and his Church, having some Analogy with it; ye we do not know, that the entrance into this state hath the promise of any Grace, to join, or preserve us in that Union with Christ and his Church. And for these reasons, we exclude it from the Sacraments of the New Law, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, with all the requisites of a Sacrament properly so called. And for our so doing, we do not want Authorities among the eminent Doctors of the Roman Church. I shall only give you two instances.

Their own *Durandus* delivers his opinion in plain terms, telling us, *Durand. That strictly and properly speaking, Marriage is not a Sacrament.* And in sentent. l. 4. Dist. Cardinal *Cajetan*, upon this place of Scripture cited by the Vindicator, hath these words, *Prudent Reader, thou learnest not here of St. Paul, 26. q. 3. that Marriage is a Sacrament; for he saith not, This Sacrament, but* *Cajetan, Annot. in this loc.*

The Additional Articles of Pope Pius's Creed,

this Mystery is great; and in truth the Mystery of those words is great.

Thus it appears, that neither from Antiquity, nor the written Word of God, any of these five Additional Sacraments of the Church of Rome, viz. *Confirmation, Penance, Extreame Unction, Order, and Matrimony*; can with any justice plead the same title to be Sacraments of the New Law, instituted by Christ, and necessary for the Salvation of Mankind; as it is confessed on all hands, Baptism and the Lord's Supper may.

I do also receive and admit of all the received and approved Ceremonies of the Catholick Church, used in the Administration of the above-mentioned Sacraments.

1 Cor.
xiv. 40.

THAT all things are to be done decently and in order, we own to be an Apostolical precept, and that in point of duty we stand obliged to yield Obedience thereunto. We also acknowledge that the Superiors in every Society are the proper Judges of that Decency and Order. And that it always hath been, and still is the practice of all well-ordered Societies, to submit to the Determination of their Superiors therein. And that to invert this Order, or for private persons to take upon them to dictate to their Governours in this case, is the only way to introduce Anarchy and Confusion. Which is all, or at least the substance of all, that the Vindicator here offers in behalf of this Article. But after this Concession, there are some things still stick with us, which will not suffer us to subscribe thereunto; viz. I. Because we are required to receive it, not only as an Article of Communion but as an Article of Faith; under the penalty of an *Anathema*, though it only concern Ceremonies, which are things mutable at the pleasure of the Church. II. Because the Ceremonies here spoken of, or some of them, neither are, nor ever were received, nor approved by the Catholick Church. III. Because the *Roman Catholick Church* (as they call it) is but a particular Church, and hath no more power to impose Ceremonies or Usages upon any other Church, than that other hath to impose upon Her. For, *Par in parem non habet imperium*. IV. If any Ceremonies imposed by the Church of Rome; or any other Church, be such, as that the Members of that Church cannot comply with them without sin and danger; the general rule of the Apostle doth not in that case bind to blind Obedience. For then there is an Apostolical pattern, which must take place, *Whether it be better to obey God, or man, judge ye*, Acts iv. 19.

I embrace and receive all and every thing, which in the Holy Council of Trent hath been defin'd, concerning Original Sin, and Justification.

IN defence of this Article, and to perswade us to a compliance therewith, the Vindicator proceeds in this method. I. He undertakes to give us an account of what the Council hath defin'd in these two points. And II. To vindicate those their Definitions. Now whether he hath been faithful in his account, or whether the Definitions of the Council, or his Vindication of them be such, as may oblige us to comply with him and the Council therein, are the things we are now to enquire into.

I. As touching *Original Sin*, it must be acknowledged that the Vindicator hath faithfully set down the Doctrine thereof, as it is defin'd by the Council of *Trent*. But notwithstanding the Authority of this Council, or the strength of the Proofs (which indeed are weak enough) whereby he endeavours to defend its Definition of this point; yet there are some things we cannot comply with, and till we are convinc'd by better Arguments than are here offered, we cannot embrace all and every thing, which in the Council of *Trent* hath been defin'd in this point.

But because the difference here is not very great, and no new matter offered, but only such as hath been over and over again considered and refuted; and because there are matters of greater moment still behind, I shall only desire the Vindicator once more to read over that very Decree upon which this part of the Article, which he is here defending, is founded, and consider one passage therein, which perhaps he might before overlook. And then I shall proceed to consider the latter part of this Article.

Concil.
Trident.
Sess. 5.
Decret. de
peccat.
Origin.
Can. 5.

The Passage is this; the Council doth there declare, *That Concupiscence doth still remain even in those that are baptized, and doth further declare, that St. Paul did sometimes call this Concupiscence, Sin.* But though the Apostle did so, yet the Council tells us, *That the Catholick Church (no doubt the Roman Catholick) did never think it to be so.* And if any one think otherwise, let him be Anathema.

In the beginning of this Decree the Council pretends to have the assistance of the Holy Ghost; whether they had or no, is not easie to be granted; but it is confessed on all hands, that *St. Paul* was inspired from above; and if so, then how comes the Council and he to be at odds in this matter? Either the Apostle or the Council were in the wrong, for both parts of a Contradiction cannot be true. Now

Aug ad
Hieron.
Epist. 19.

whether the Authority of *St. Paul*, or that of the Council of *Trent* be the better, one would think were no very hard Question. *St. Austin*, I am sure, did not think it was; for if he had, he would not have been so positive as he was, when he said, *The Authority of St. Paul is to me instead of all the Fathers, and above all the Fathers; to him I flee, and to him I appeal from all other Doctors whatsoever.*

II. Concerning Justification, he gives us an account of what the Council of *Trent* hath defin'd in Four particulars:

1. That Men are justified by an intrinsecal Justice. And this he founds upon Two places of Scripture, viz. *Tit. iij. 7.* where it is said, *That being justified by his Grace, we should be made Heirs, according to the hope of Eternal Life. Which Grace, saith he, is in Men.* And for this he quotes, *2 Tim. i. 6.* where it is said, *I put thee in mind to stir up that Grace which is in thee.* So he renders it; but it is more properly translated, *I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the Gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on my Hands.* Which last words he leaves out.

Rom. iij.
24

To this I answer. What *St. Paul* here means, by being justified by his Grace, he himself very well explains in another place, where he saith, *Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ.* Where to be justified Freely, and to be justified by Grace, are Synonymous Expressions, and imply no more, but that God did freely, and without any merit of ours, send his Son to die for sinners; and by his Death to make satisfaction to divine Justice for our sins; and by that means to obtain such Grace and Favour with God, that our Sins might be Pardoned, and we Justified before him. whence it is very plain, That by the Grace of God, we are not to understand any intrinsecal Righteousness of our own, but the free Grace and Favour of God, in accepting the Righteousness of Christ, instead of ours, and imputing the same to us, through Faith, for our Justification. And therefore *St. Paul* after he had a little more explain'd himself, concludes, saying, *Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by Faith, without the Deeds of the Law.*

1 Cor. 28.

As for his other Scripture, which he brings in as an Auxiliary Proof, it is quite foreign to the matter in hand; for the Apostle there doth not speak of Justifying Grace, nor indeed of any Grace, if we take the word strictly; for the word there is not *χρημα*, as in the other, but *χρησμα*, which signifies not Grace, but a Gift. And the Gift which he there puts him in mind to stir up, was the Gift of preaching. As if he should have said, Be sure courageously to preach the Gospel, and exercise that Ministerial Function, which thou hast received by the Imposition of my Hands.

But

But I find this Gentleman is under a great mistake, he takes Justification and Sanctification to be one and the same thing; but I cannot much blame him for it, because I know he is led into it by an Authority, which he thinks, to be Infallible, and consequently Indisputable, viz. the Council of Trent, which teacheth him, *That Justification consists not only in Remission of Sins, but in Sanctification also and the renewing of the inward Man, by a voluntary susception of Grace and Gifts; by which, of Unrighteous a Man is made Righteous, and of an Enemy a Friend, that he may be an Heir according to the Hope of Eternal Life.* This is a far different Notion from that which the Church of England, and the Holy Scriptures give us of Justification. They teach us, That by Justification we are to understand only Absolution, or Remission of Sins; but the Church of Rome confounds Justification with Sanctification, and the Remission of Sins with the Renovation of our Minds. And indeed in this Channel runs the main difference between us and them through the whole Controversie. The Church of England delivers her Sentiments touching Justification thus: *We are accounted Righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deserving.* Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort. And for a farther Explication thereof, she refers to the Homily of Justification; where she declares, *That by Justification, she means the Forgiveness of our Sins and Trespases. That this being received of God's Mercy and Christ's Merits, embraced by Faith, is taken and allowed of God for our perfect and full Justification. That nothing on the behalf of Man, doth contribute to this Justification, but only a true and lively Faith, which Faith is also the Gift of God: Yet doth not this Faith exclude Good-works, nor the necessity of them in Justified Persons, but only shuts them out from the Office of Justifying.* This is the Doctrine of the Church of England; and for this she hath good Authority both in Scripture and Fathers; but I must not now enter upon this Controversie, lest I lose the Vindicator therein. I shall therefore proceed to his next particular.

Art. 11.
2 Hom. of
Justificat.
part 1.

2. He tells us, That the Council of Trent hath defin'd, *That all Works of the Just are not Sins.* This, saith he, is evident in Scripture, as Luke i. 6. where 'tis said of Zacharias and Elizabeth, *They were both Righteous before God; walking in all the Commandments and Ordinances of the Lord, blameless.* And 1 John v. 18. *Whosoever is born of God, sinneth not.* Which likewise proves, *That the Commandments are not impossible to be kept,* as the same Council declares.

To this I answer, If the Premises be good, the Inference therefrom, I confess, is natural; For if Justified persons be so Righteous,

as to be void of all Sin, they may, no doubt, keep all the Commandments. But if the Foundation which he builds upon happen to fail him, all his Superstructure will fall to the Ground. Let us therefore Examine that, whether it be firm and good.

In order whereunto let me premise, That there is a Legal and Evangelical Righteousness: The former of which consists in a perfect and unfinning Obedience to the whole Law; And the latter in a sincere desire and endeavour to keep all God's Commandments. The former of these, it is not in the power of fallen Man, to attain unto: And to justify this Assertion, we have good warrant from the Holy Scriptures; The wise *Soloman*, in his Prayer at the Dedication of the Temple, humbly confesseth, *There is no Man that sinneth not*, 1 Kings viij. 46. And *St. Paul* tells us, *The Scripture hath concluded all under Sin*, Gal. iij. 22. And *St. James* saith, *In many things we offend all*, Jam. iij. 2. *And if we say that we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the Truth is not in us*, saith the Apostle, *John* 1 Ep. c. i. v. 8. I might add many more places of Scripture to this purpose, but these may suffice to show us, how far it is out of the power of fallen Man, to perform a perfect and unfinning Obedience to the Law of God. But the latter, viz. an Evangelical Righteousness, we acknowledge to be attainable in this Life. It is possible for a good Man sincerely to desire, and honestly to endeavour to keep all the Commandments of his God; and though he fail in the attempt, by reason of the corruption and depravation of his Nature; yet God, for Christ's sake, will pardon those Failings, and accept of those his honest Endeavours. For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a Man hath, and not according to that he hath not, saith *St. Paul*, 2 Cor. viij. 12. And according to this Notion of Righteousness it is, that holy and good Men are said to be Just and Righteous. So *St. Hierom* saith, *Men are called just, not because they are void of all Sin; but because in the main they are Vertuous*. And *S. Aug.* saith, *The Vertue that is now in a just Man, so far forth is called perfect, that it pertaineth to the perfection thereof, both in Truth to know, and in Humility to confess, that it is imperfect*.

Hierom.
ad Ctesiphon.
Aug. ad Bonifacium, l. 3. c. 7.

Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 19 c. 26. *Ipsa nostra iustitia, quamvis vera sit propior veri boni finem ad quem refertur, tamen tanta est in hac vita, ut potius peccatorum remissione consistat, quam perfectione virtutum.*

And the same *St. Aug.* in another place saith, *Our very Righteousness it self is such in this life, that it stands rather in the Remission of Sins, than in the perfection of Righteousness*. Thus *Job*, by the Mouth of God himself, is stiled, *A perfect and upright Man, one that feared God, and eschewed evil*, Job i. 8. and yet he cursed the day of his Birth, c. iij. And thus *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth* are said to be both Righteous before God, and to walk in all the Commandments and Ordinances blameless, i. e. Their Lives and Conversations were so good and

and vertuous, that no Man had any just cause to blame them. But that they were without sin, doth not appear; but the contrary is very manifest, for not long after we find *Zacharias* punished for his Unbelief, Luk. i. 20.

His other Scripture Proof (which is 1 *John* v. 18. *Whosoever is born of God, sinneth not,*) will do him no better service than his Former. For the same Apostle in the same Epistle, c. i. v. 8. saith, *If we say, that we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us.* If therefore the Text by him alledged, be so to be understood, as if the Regenerate were free from all manner of sin; then must he say that St. *John*, and those he speaks of in the other Text, were not born of God, or else that he contradicts himself in these two places; neither of which, I presume, they will dare to say. We must therefore find out another sence of these words, which methinks is very obvious. *Whosoever is born of God, sinneth not,* i. e. He doth not make a trade of sin, or he doth not deliberately, and on set purpose sin against God. This their own *Lyra*, if he had consulted him, would have told him; for he saith, *That the intention of the Apostle in Lyra in this place, is not to secure the Regenerate from all sin, but from that sin loc. unto death, of which he speaks, v. 16.*

Thus have I examined his proofs, and find them to fall far short of proving what he pretends to prove by them. But if I should grant his Proposition, which he calls a Definition of the Council, to be true; yet I do not see how the possibility of keeping the Commandments can thence be inferred. *All works of the just,* he saith, *are not sins.* What then; doth it necessarily follow, That it is possible for the Regenerate to keep all the Commandments? No surely; for though all be not, yet if any of them be, it will be a sufficient bar to this Inference; So St. *James* thought, or else he would not have said, *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet faileth in one point, he is guilty of all,* Jam. ij. 10. Unless therefore they will understand, a possibility of keeping the Commandments, in the same sence that St. *Austin* doth (who tells us, *All the Commandments of God are accounted to be done, when that thing that is not done, is forgiven*) I do not see how it can be asserted, much less defended. And if thus they understand it, we shall not quarrel with them about it.

Aug. Re-
tract. l. 1.
c. 19.

III. He tells us, That the Council hath defin'd, *That a man justified, truly deserves life everlasting by his good works.* And this he undertakes to prove both by Scripture, and the Testimony of St. *Austin*.

Before I come particularly to examine his Proofs, the force of all which stands in a misunderstanding of the Words, *Merit* and *Reward*; It will be convenient, for a more clear decision of the difference between

between us, to state the true notion of those words; for Ambiguity of Words often hath been, and still is, not only the occasion of hot and fierce Disputes among men, but of their continuance also.

That the word, *Merit*, is frequently used by the Fathers we own; but that they used it in that sence, in which the present Church of Rome doth, we deny; and thence ariseth the difference between us. The Holy Fathers understood no more by it, than *Obtaining or Impetration*; but the Romanists would now have it to be understood of *Earning or Deserving* in the way of *Condign Wages*; as if there were an equality of due proportion between our Works and Heaven, without any respect had to Pact, Promise or Favour.

Bellarmino de
Justificat.
L. 5. c. 17.

To make a work truly meritorious, it must have these five Qualifications:

1. The work that is done, must not be a work that is due to be done. For it is no merit for a man to pay his debts. Now our Saviour tells us, *When we have done all those things which are commanded us, we are still but unprofitable Servants, having done only that which was our duty to do*, Luke xvij. 10.

2. The thing we offer must be our own. For to present any thing to another that belongs unto him, is no merit in us. Now St. Paul tells us, *We are not sufficient of our selves, to think any thing as of our selves, but all our sufficiency is of God*, 2 Cor. iij. 5.

3. The work that a man doth to merit of another, must be profitable to that other, of whom he designs to merit. For no man will pretend to merit by an unprofitable service. Now holy David freely confesseth, *That his Goodness did not extend to God*, i. e. was no way profitable or advantageous to him, Ps. xvi. 2.

4. The work we do to merit withal, must not be defective. For if there be any thing in it that wants a pardon, it can never truly merit. Now St. John tells us, *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us*, 1 John i. 8.

5. There must be some proportion between the Work and the Reward. Otherwise we cannot be said to deserve it. In St. Paul's account, *The afflictions of this present time* (and certainly Suffering is more than Doing) *are not worthy of the Glory which shall be revealed in us*, Rom. viij. 18.

These are the requisites of Merit, which if well attended to, may be very useful in deciding this Difficulty, and determining this matter in difference between us. Let us now consider the other word, viz. *Reward*.

That the Word, *Reward*, is frequently used both in Scripture, and by the Fathers, we own; and that the strict and proper notion of it,

is a Debt due to man for the work he hath done, we deny not. But that it was ever used in this sence with respect to God, or that ever any man, according to this notion of the Word, can be said to deserve a reward at God's hands, we can by no means grant. And hence ariseth the difference between the Church of Rome and us; in order to the deciding of which, let us consider that there is a twofold Reward, the one due, the other not due; the one given as a just retribution for the work done, and the other freely, or, at most, according to Pact and Promise. This distinction is fairly founded in Scripture, where St. Paul saith, *To him that worketh, the reward is not accounted to be of grace, but of debt*, Rom. iv. 4. Which plainly implies, that a free gift bestowed out of meer bounty and liberality may be called a Reward, as well as that, which by the strict rules of Justice is due to Merit. And thus we find it in Scripture sometimes given to the one, and sometimes to the other: For, that which in *Matth. v. 46.* is called *μισθός* a Reward, in *Luke vi. 32.* is called *χάρις* a Grace, or Free Gift. And the peny given to the labourer who came in at the last hour is called *μισθός* a Reward, though much above his desert, *Matth. xx. 8.* Upon which St. Ambrose very well observes, *There is a kind of Reward, which is given of liberality and of Grace, and another which is the wages of Vertue, and the recompence of a man's labour.* Ambr. 1.1. Ep. 1.

Having thus stated the true notion of these two words, *Merit* and *Reward*, upon which depends the whole Controversie between us; I shall now take a more particular view of his Proofs.

His first Scripture proof is, *Rev. iiij. 4.* From which he thus argues, *Thou hast a few names in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments (there is Purity and Justice) and they shall walk with me in white, (there is the Reward, and the reason follows) for they are worthy.*

The whole stress of this Argument lies in the word *worthy*, a right understanding whereof, will facilitate our answer thereunto.

St. Paul expressly saith, *I reckon that the afflictions of this present time are not worthy* * (*ὡς ἀξία*) *of the glory, which shall be shewed unto us*, Rom. viij. 18. The Glory which St. Paul here speaks of, and the *White Array*, which St. John mentions, do certainly import one and the same thing, *viz.* Eternal Life. Of which St. Paul saith, all our Sufferings, (and certainly they are more valuable than our Doings) are not worthy. And yet those who had not defiled their garments, are said to be worthy (*ἀξιοί εἰναι*) to walk in white, i. e. to be made partakers of Life and Glory.

This looks like a perfect contradiction, which we cannot suppose these two holy and inspired Men could be guilty of: for, as they were

* *Condignæ ad futuram Gloriam.*
Vulg. Lat.

both taught by the same Spirit, so, no doubt, they both spake the same thing. To reconcile them therefore, we must find out another sense of the Word, *Worthy*, than this Gentleman puts upon it; and, I think, it is no difficult matter so to do. For a Man may be said to be worthy of a Reward either upon his own account, or upon the account of another; either for the sake of his own deservings, or for the sake of another's merits. To be worthy in the former sense, a Man must have all those Requisites and Qualifications, which are required to make up a Merit strictly so called; but to be worthy in the other sense, requires no more but only to be fitted and disposed to receive those favours, which are merited for him by another. That according to the latter of these notions we are to understand the worthyness here spoken of, will appear plainly; if we consider, That the word ἀξίος which is here rendred Worthy, may be, and often is rendred *fit* or *meet*; as for instance, St. John Baptist warns the Pharisees and Sadduces which came to his Baptism, *To bring forth fruits (ἀξίους ἔργα) worthy of, or meet for, repentance*, that so they might escape the wrath to come. *i. e.* Let your Reformation declare your Repentance to be such, as may fit you to come to this Baptism, and consequently to escape wrath; let your Repentance be according to the measure of your sin, if your Sins have been great, so must your Repentance be too. So their own *Lyra* understands it. And the venerable *Bede* gives this reason for it, *Because the same measure of Repentance is not required of him who is guilty of little or no Sin, as of him who hath more grievously offended.* By fruits worthy of Repentance, we are therefore to understand such fruits as are meet to testify the truth of our Repentance, and fit us to receive Grace and Favour offered. And if we consider the following words, they will farther confirm us herein; for it is added, *v. 5. He that overcometh, shall be clothed in white array, &c.* Whence it is evident, that to walk in white, or to be worthy to do so, was not a privilege peculiar to those few names in Sardis which had not defiled their garments, but to all others, who by Faith are armed with the power of Christ, and by that means obtain a Victory over the World and the Devil; for they also shall be clothed with white array. This well represents that Righteousness wherewith all the blessed ones shall stand clothed and covered before God; which is not their own, but a Righteousness given unto them by another, and put upon them. And is the same spoken of by holy *David*, and quoted by St. Paul, when he had occasion to treat of this argument. *Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord imputeth not sin.* To be worthy therefore imports not, that Men do merit

Matth. iij.

Luk. iij. 8.

Lyra in

oc.

ed. apud

St. Ord. in

oc.

xxxij.

2.

pm. iv.

7: 8.

merit eternal life by their works, but it imports a fitness and capacity in them to receive it, being justified by Faith in Christ Jesus, as their holy and godly life did declare.

His next Scripture proof is, *Matth. v. 12. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven*: Whence he inferrs, that Heaven is given as a reward for their suffering, and good Works.

That Heaven is a Reward, we grant, but it is a Reward of Grace, not of Debt; That it is given to those that suffer for Righteousness sake and do well, we deny not; but it is not given them for their suffering or well-doing. And we acknowledge, that it is a great Reward, so great, that it far exceeds the merit of all that we can do or suffer; *For our light afflictions which are but for a moment, work for us a far more exceeding* (*καὶ ὑπερβαλλὼν εἰς ὑπερβαλλὼν*) *and eternal weight of glory,* saith St. Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 17.

His last Scripture is, *Matth. xxv. 34.* where our Saviour is giving an account in what manner he will proceed in the last Judgment. What inference the Vindicator would draw from hence, he leave us to divine; for he only quotes it, and so leaves it; and so shall I too, till he thinks fit to form his argument, and bless the World with the sight of it. But he closeth up his Scripture Arguments with this Salvo, *All this as supposing and built upon the promise of Christ, and his assisting grace.* Which, if I mistake not, is a full confutation of all that he hath been endeavouring to prove: For if our good works be done by his assisting grace, (as undoubtedly they are) then are they not so our own, as to merit by them; and if our deserving life everlasting must suppose, and be built upon the promise of Christ, then is it not a Reward of Debt, but of Grace, or by Pact and Promise; which is the thing we contend for.

And now I come to examine his Authorities, which he brings out of two Epistles of St. *Austin*, viz. the 105. and the 118. *ad Sixt.* I have carefully read over these two Epistles, which, I question, whether the Vindicator has done; for if he had, he would not have been guilty of so great a mistake; for, the 118 Epistle is not directed to *Sixtus* (as he saith it is) but to *Januarius*; nor is there one word in it of all that he here quotes out of it, nor any one Syllable relating to that matter; it being wholly spent in directing him how to conform himself to the Customs of any particular Church where he came, provided they were not contrary to Faith and good manners, especially in the business of *Fasting*, and the *Eucharist*. The 105. Epistle is indeed directed to *Sixtus*, (though he doth not tell us it is) and in that I meet with what he here sets down; which makes me conjecture that he hath taken it from some other upon trust; for if he

did consult the Author himself, he betrays a great want either of honesty or ingenuity or both. For it is not honest in any man to curtail his Author's Sence, nor is it very ingenuous by that means to endeavour to impose upon unwary Readers. All therefore that I have here to do, is, to bring *St. Austin* to speak for himself, and so leave the unbyassed Reader to judge between us. The design of *St. Austin* in this Epistle is to instruct *Sixtus* how to answer the Arguments of the *Pelagians*, who were then the great Advocates for *Free Will* and *Merit*, by advancing the *Free Grace* and *Mercy* of God against them. *St. Austin* in this Epistle hath these words which the Vindicator sets down, viz. *As death is rendred to the Merit of sin, as the pay; so everlasting life is rendred as the pay, to the merit of Justice.* But he doth not tell you what goes before, nor what follows after those words in that place; If he had you would more clearly have understood *St. Austin's* meaning, than perhaps he desired you should. To undeceive you therefore I shall give you the passage intire as it is in the Author. When *St. Paul* (saith he) in *Rom. vi. 23.* had said, *The wages of sin is death, who would not have expected that he should have added; and the wages of righteousness is eternal life? And truly it is so, for as death is rendred to the merit of sin, as the wages; so eternal life, as the wages, is rendred to the merit of Righteousness.* But the blessed Apostle to repress the pride of Men, saith, *The Wages of Sin is Death.* Truly *Wages*, because due, because worthily deserved, because rendred to *Merit*. But then to prevent the exalting of our selves upon the account of our own *Merit* or *Righteousness*, he doth not say, *The Wages of Righteousness is eternal Life; but the gift of God is eternal Life.* And that we may not seek it in any other way, he adds, *In Christ Jesus our Lord.* As if he should have said, *O Humane, not Righteousness, but Pride in the name of Righteousness, why dost thou begin to exalt thy self, and to require eternal Life, as Wages due to thee? It is true Righteousness, to which eternal life is due; But if it be true Righteousness, it is not of thy self, but is from above, coming down from the Father of lights. Wherefore, O Man, if thou art about to receive eternal Life, it is indeed the Wages of Righteousness, but to thee it is a Grace, to whom Righteousness it self is a Grace.*

In the same Epistle, I also meet with these words, *Are there no Merits of the Righteous? surely there are, because they are Righteous. But they had no Merits by which they became Righteous. For they are made Righteous, when they are justified, but as the Apostle saith, They are justified freely by his Grace, Rom. iij.* And to explain himself, a little after he adds, *That Grace would not be Grace, if it were not given freely, but rendred as a due Debt.*

In the same Epistle, I find also these words, *It is not therefore in*
vain

vain that we sing unto God, His mercy shall prevent me; and His mercy shall follow me. Whence life eternal it self, which in the end shall be enjoyed without end, and therefore is rendred to precedent merits, yet because those merits to which it is given, are not prepared by any ability of ours, but are wrought in us by Grace, even Life eternal it self is called Grace, for no other reason but because it is given freely, not therefore because it is not given to Merits, but because those very Merits to which it is given, are themselves a gift.

These words are an Inference from what went before, where St. *Austin* argues against Merit, either before, to obtain Grace; or after, to deserve a Reward. These are his words, *What is the Merit of Man before Grace, by which he may deservedly obtain Grace, when as all our Merit is from Grace, and when he crowns our Merits, he crowns nothing else but his own Gifts?* And from hence he inferrs in the words before cited, Whence I observe, 1. That all that is good in us here, is owing to Divine Mercy preventing us. 2. That all the good we can expect hereafter, must be from the same Divine Mercy following us. 3. That Life eternal, which is the great Reward of Vertue and Goodness, is called Grace. 4. That though it be said to be given to Merits, it is not said to be given for the sake of those Merits. 5. That those Merits to which it is given are themselves the gift of God, and therefore not Merits in the strict sence of the word. *It is not Righteousness, but Pride in the name of Righteousness, that expects eternal Life as a Reward due to its deserving:* These are St. *Austin's* own words in the next page, which directly contradict this Definition of the Council of *Trent*, viz. *That a man justified truly deserves Life everlasting by his good works.* And now if the Vindicator can make any advantage of these words of St. *Austin* either to himself, or to his cause, I shall not envy him.

IV. He tells us, that the Council hath defin'd, *That by works a Man is justified, and not by Faith only.* And to prove this he alledgeth, *Jam. ij. 24.* where it is said, *ye see then, how that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only.*

This place of Scripture hath been so often urged, and all the Arguments raised therefrom so often, and so miserably baffled; that I wonder with what confidence this Gentleman could bring it upon the stage again. They have been often told, that St. *James* here doth not speak of Justification before God, but before Men. That as Faith only (though that Faith be not alone) justifies us before God, so good Works do justify the truth of that Faith, and evidence the reality of our Justification thereby unto Men. Which Interpretation is well warranted by St. *Paul*, when he saith, *If Abraham was justified by Works, then hath he whereof to glory, but not before God, Rom. iv. 2.*

I like-

I likewise profess, That in the Mass is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, for the Living and the Dead.

TO persuade us to a compliance herewith, the Vindicator advanceth both Scripture and Antiquity; Two great Arguments if well managed. Which whether they be or no, I shall now Examine.

1. He begins with Scripture, and by way of Preface thereunto tells us, *That our blessed Saviour being a Priest according to the Order of Melchisedeck, did at his last Supper offer his Body and Blood after an unbloody manner, for the Remission of Sins.*

This is unhappily to stumble at the Threshold. For, 1. How his Consequent comes to be tack'd to his Antecedent is past my capacity to understand. Our blessed Saviour was *made a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck*: Therefore *at his last Supper he did offer his Body and Blood after an unbloody manner, for the Remission of Sins.* What Logick there is in this, I am yet to learn. 2. If he did offer himself at his last Supper, to whom did he do it? For we do not find that he did address himself, or offer any thing to any, but only to his Disciples; and surely he will not say that he offered himself as a Sacrifice unto them. 3. If he did offer his Body and Blood, then was it not an unbloody Sacrifice, as they say it was. 4. If it was an unbloody Sacrifice, then could it not be propitiatory; *For without shedding of Blood, there is no Remission of Sins*, Heb. ix. 22.

But the Vindicator hath good Scripture for all this, viz. Luke xxij. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24. Matth. xxvi. 28. In all which places the Words of Institution are recited, with some variation; St. Matthew saith, *This is my Body*, vers. 26. St. Luke adds, *Which is given for you*. And St. Paul saith, *Which is broken for you*. His whole Argument there depends upon the Words of Institution: Before therefore I meddle with his reasoning therefrom, it will be convenient to consider and explain them. And, 1. Our Saviour saith, *This is*, not, *This is Transubstantiate*, or, *wonderfully converted into another substance*, viz, the substance of my Body. 2. If when he said, *This is*, he meant *Transubstantiation*, then his Body must be Transubstantiated before he spake; and if so, then the Conversion doth not depend upon the Words, as they affirm; For, *This is*, implies a thing already done. 3. When he said, *This is my Body*, it is evident, that his true, natural, humane Body was there with them, took the Bread, brake it, gave it, eat it; now if that which he took, brake, gave and eat, was then the Body of Christ; either he must have two Bodies there at that time, or else the same Body was by the same Body taken, broken, given and eaten; and

and yet all the while neither taken, broken, given nor eaten. 4. When he saith, *This is my Body which is given for you*, as St. Luke, or, *Which is broken for you*, as St. Paul; if it be understood literally, then must it be either his natural or his glorified Body; if they say the former, then we urge them again with the preceding Observation; the latter they will not dare to say, because his Body was not then Glorified. 5. If these words be to be literally and strictly to be understood, then the substance of Bread must be Christ's Body at that time; for what can any Man living understand by, *This*, but only *this Bread*? For, what he took he blessed; what he blessed, he brake; what he brake, he gave to his Disciples; what he gave to them, he bad them take and eat; and what he bad them take and eat, of that he saith, *This is my Body*; and all this he himself tells us was Bread. And that it did not receive any such wonderful Conversion or Change as they believe it did, by the pronouncing of those words, St. Paul, who may be presumed to understand the mind of his Master, as well as any of them, is a very good Evidence; who after the Words of Consecration, by which they pretend the Change is made, doth over and over again call it Bread; as you may read, 1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, &c. 6. When he saith, *Do this in remembrance of me*, it implies an Absence; for we can no more be said to remember that which is present, than to see that which is absent. 7. When it is said, *This Cup is the New-Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of Sins*; Are these words to be understood literally too? Must we believe, that by the pronouncing of these words, there is a substantial Change made? If so, then it must not be of the Wine, but of the Cup; and that not into the Blood of Christ, but into the New Testament, or New Covenant in his Blood, which none of them as yet have been so bold as to affirm. 8. If we consider that our Saviour celebrated this Sacrament before his Passion, and said, *This is my Body which is broken*, and, *This is my Blood which is shed*, it cannot be literally true of his natural, humane Body, for that was then whole and unbroken, and his Blood was not then shed. And indeed it was impossible that the Disciples should understand these words literally, because they not only plainly saw that what he gave them was Bread and Wine, but they saw likewise as plainly that it was not his Body which was given; but his Body which gave that which was given; not his Body broken and Blood shed, because they saw him alive at that very time, and beheld his Body whole and unpierced.

Having thus considered the words of Institution, and made some Remarks upon them, let us now see how the Vindicator argues therefrom.

His

His first Remark is, That the words of Institution are spoken in the present Tense, whence he thus argues, *That it is certain, that then, before the Passion on the Cross, the Body was given, and broken Mystically, and the Chalice shed for the Remission of Sins.*

To this I answer, 1. That if the Vindicator had consulted the *Romish Bible*, or the *Mass*, he might there have found *Tradetur* instead of *Traditur*, *shall be given*, instead of *is given*; and *Effundetur* instead of *Effunditur*, *shall be shed*, instead of *is shed*. Which words were likewise long ago used by *Origen* and *St. Chrysostom*; and the Jesuit *Sa* would have told him, in *Greek* it is said, *Which is shed*, the time present for the time to come. And Cardinal *Cajetan* would have informed him, even as the Evangelists by the time present have expressed the future Effusion of Blood, saying, *is shed*; *St. Paul* likewise saying,

Origen in Matth.
Tract. 35.

Chrysost. in 1 Cor.

11.

Sa in verb. Matth.

Cajetan in Luc. 22.

Barrad.
Harmon.
Evange-
ilist. Tom.
4. l. 3. c. 4.

is broken, signifieth by the present time, the breaking of his Body, which was after to be done upon the Cross. And *Barradius* the Jesuit saith, *The Lord useth the time present instead of the future time, which then approached*; for the words ought to be understood of his future passion, which then drew near; in this sence, *This is my Body which shall shortly be given for you, to suffer and to die*. So that though the words were really spoken in the present Tense, yet did not that hinder either the Primitive Fathers, their own Translators of the Bible, the Compilers of their Mass, or their own Eminent Doctors, from understanding them of the time to come. Nor is it to be wondered at, for they well knew that it was our Saviour's way and manner of speaking: As for instance, before any of the Jews were come to lay hands on him, he said, *Behold the Son of Man, who is betrayed, or given, into the hands of Sinners*, Matth. xxvi. 45. *Therefore doth my Father love me, because, ἵνα ἵδω τὸν υἱόν μου, I lay down my Life, that I may take it again*, John x. 17. And in another place, *I am no more in the World*, John xvij. 11. And *St. Paul* in conformity to his Master's way and manner of speaking, saith, *Ἐγὼ ἤδη προσέδομαι, I am already offered up*, 2 Tim. iv. 6. All which considered, it will not appear to be so very certain, as this Gentleman thinks it is, *That the Body of Christ was given and broken before his Passion on the Cross*. But 2dly. He seems to qualifie the rigour of his Assertion, by telling us, *That all this was done Mystically*. To which I answer, That if by Mystically he mean Sacramentally, i. e. That our blessed Saviour, by what he did at his last Supper, intended to signify to his Disciples what he was about to do and suffer for them, and the rest of Mankind, the day following, we shall not differ with him about it. But if by Mystically he mean Really, though Invisibly, (as undoubtedly he doth) we cannot agree

agree with him; for in a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, (as the Article which he here undertakes to defend calls it) the thing offered ought to be visible, and there ought to be a Destruction of it in the Sacrifice; none of all which appears to be in this Action of our Blessed Saviour.

But he proceeds, *Which (saith he) being done in an unbloody manner, and offered to God, we call it an unbloody Sacrifice; and it being for the Remission of Sins, 'tis likewise propitiatory.*

To this I answer, 1. The Vindicator here takes that for granted, which we can by no means allow him, viz. That the Body of Christ was given and broken Mystically, and the Chalice shed for the Remission of Sins, before his Passion on the Cross. And why we cannot admit of this, I have given you an Account already. 2. He contradicts himself, for he tells us, *This was done in an unbloody manner;* and yet he had before told us, *That the Chalice was shed,* by which I suppose he means (if he have any meaning in it) the Blood in the Chalice: Now if Christ's Blood was shed, how could it be done in an unbloody manner? Or how could it be called an unbloody Sacrifice? 3. He tells us, *It was offer'd to God,* but how doth that appear? That our Saviour in his last Supper did indeed offer Bread and Wine to his Disciples, is very plain and evident; but that he offered either them or any thing else to God, the Words of Institution give us no account. 4. *That it being for Remission of Sins, it was likewise propitiatory.* And here he is under a great mistake, for every thing, that is for Remission of Sins, is not a propitiatory Sacrifice. The Baptism of John, and his Preaching, was for the Remission of Sins, *Mark i. 4.* And so likewise is Baptism and Repentance, *Acts ij. 38.* And yet, I suppose, the Vindicator will not say, That either Baptism, or Preaching, or Repentance are propitiatory Sacrifices. But perhaps he will say, That all shedding of Blood made for Remission of Sins, is a propitiatory Sacrifice. I cannot consent to him in this neither, for there is a shedding of Blood sacramental and not real, which is made to represent the shedding of Christ's Blood upon the Cross, and that is no propitiatory Sacrifice. But what if it be real? Though it be, yet will not the proposition be universally true; for the Blood of our Lord was really shed, and for Remissions of Sins too, at his Circumcision; and yet Circumcision was no Sacrifice. In a true propitiatory Sacrifice three Things are required. 1. There must be a real Effusion of Blood. 2. That real Effusion of Blood must be for the Remission of Sins. 3. That Effusion of Blood must be by the Death of the thing offered. None of which are to be found in this Action of our Blessed Saviour at his last Supper, and therefore it could not be a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice.

But if we should grant (which we cannot do) that this were a Sacrifice, and a propitiatory Sacrifice too, will it by a necessary Consequence follow, that every Mass-Priest at this day doth in the Mass offer a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, for the Living and the Dead ? Yes, saith the Vindicator, For, though Christ was offered but once upon the Cross, (of which St. Paul speaketh, *Hebr. vij. 27.*) yet in this manner, as Christ offered himself at his last Supper, we believe that the Apostles and their Successors were commanded to repeat it, in a perpetual memory, and representation of his Death and Passion, by Christ's own Institution, when he said to them, *Do this in remembrance of me*; in which words he gave them power of doing the same that he had done. To this I answer, That in the same manner as Christ offered himself at his last Supper, he is offered still; *i. e.* Sacramentally; and that by the command of Christ we are obliged often to celebrate or repeat this Sacrament in memory of his Death and Passion upon the Cross: And that by virtue of those Words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Power was give to the Apostles and their Successors to do the same thing he did, *i. e.* to celebrate this Sacrament in memory of his Death and Passion on the Cross. All this we readily grant, but what is all this to the Priest's Offering in the Mass, a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead?

Those of the Roman Communion do indeed lay great stress upon these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, pretending to find therein a power given to every Mass-Priest to offer up the Son of God as a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, for the Living and the Dead. But if they would but consult St. Paul, he would better inform them what the importance of these words is: For after he had recited the words of Institution, and in the close thereof these very words, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; in the very next words he tells them what it was they were to do in remembrance of him, saying, *As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come*, 1 Cor. xi. 26.

2. Having gone as far as he can with his Scripture proofs, he calls in the assistance of Antiquity, telling us with sufficient confidence, *That this (i. e. the matter contained in this Article) is the Sense of the Primitive Fathers*. Whether it be or no, is the thing we are now to consider; and for that purpose I shall examine his Quotations out of them.

His first Witness is St. Chrysost. *Hom. 7.* (I suppose he means 17.) in *Ep. ad Hebr.* where it is said, *We still offer the same Sacrifice*, &c.

To this I answer, What St. Chrysostom meant by those words, I know no body can better inform us, than St. Chrysostom himself, who immediately

immediately subjoins, *μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναμνησκόμεθα τοῦ αὐτοῦ θυσίας*: Or to speak more properly, we make a commemoration of the same Sacrifice. And in the same Homily, had the Vindicator carefully perused it, or been so honest as to have noted it, he might have found such Expressions as these, *We offer indeed, but it is in remembrance of his Death. This Sacrifice is an Example of that Sacrifice. This which we now do, is in commemoration of that which hath been done.* But that which the Vindicator seems to lay the great stress upon, is, That St. Chrysostom in this Homily, and likewise, l. 6. de Sacerd. calls the Eucharist a Sacrifice. We grant it, but if he will let him explain himself, he will tell him upon what account he so calleth it in this Homily, *Because it representeth the Sacrifice of our Lord's Death, and therein we commemorate the same till his coming again.* And in the other place, *Because we pray unto God, that he would receive the Sacrifice of his Death as a satisfaction for our Sins.*

His next Evidence is St. Ambrose, sup. Ps. 38. Where he speaks of the Priest's offering Sacrifice for the People, and of Christ's being offered up upon Earth, when his Body is offered. St. Ambrose in the same place explains himself, saying, *The Shadow went before, the Image followed, the Truth shall be. The Shadow in the Law, the Image in the Gospel, the Truth in the Heavens. O Man, go up into Heaven, and thou shalt see those things whereof here was an Image and a Shadow.* Where he plainly tells us, that what is done here upon Earth, is only an Image or Representation. And in another place he saith, *We have In Luc. 1. seen him and look'd upon him with our Eyes, and we have thrust our Fingers 5. c. 7. into the print of his Nails. For we seem to see him, that we read of, and to have beheld him hanging upon the Cross, and with the feeling Spirit of the Church to have searched his Wounds.* Now as St. Ambrose here saith, *We see him hanging on the Cross, &c.* In like manner doth he say, *He is offered up upon Earth, when his Body is offered.* For as their own Gloss upon the Sentences of Prosper saith, *Christ is Sacrificed, i. e. his Sacrifice is represented, and a commemoration is made of his Passion.*

His next Authority is Cyril. Alex. Anath. 11. *We celebrate in our Churches an Holy, Life-giving, and Unbloody Sacrifice.* What St. Cyril meant by this Unbloody Sacrifice, he himself will best inform us, if we consult him about it; for in another place he saith, *We having left the gross Ministry of the Jews, have a commandment, to make a fine, thin, and spiritual Sacrifice. And therefore we offer unto God for a sweet smelling savour all manner of Vertues, Faith, Hope, Charity.* And in the same sence that he calls these Sacrifices, doth he call the Eucharist an unbloody Sacrifice i. e. A Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

His last Reserve is St. August. who l. 9. Confess. c. 13. speaks of his Mother Monica desiring to be remembered at the Altar after her death; because

because she knew that thence was dispens'd the Holy Victim, by which was cancelled the Hand-writing, which was contrary unto us. And *Serm. 32. de Verb. Apost.* where he speaks of a propitiatory Sacrifice, and Alms offered for Souls departed; and of commemorating the Dead at the Sacrifice; and of a Sacrifice being offered for them.

That Christians did usually meet to celebrate the memorial of Holy Martyrs, and others departed in the Faith of Christ; and that some kind of prayers were in St. *Austin's* time used for the dead, we deny not. But these are not the things in question, but whether in the Mass there be offer'd a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead. To prove this he produceth these passages of St. *Austin*, wherein he seems to call the Eucharist, *the holy Victim*, and *the Sacrifice*. Now what St. *Austin* meant by these words he himself shall tell you.

In his Book of Faith he calls it, *A Sacrifice of Bread and Wine offered in Faith and Charity, and A Commemoration of the Flesh of Christ which he offered for us, and of the Blood which he shed for us.* And in another place, *To eat the Bread in the New Testament, is the Sacrifice of Christians.* And again, *This Flesh and Blood of Christ was promised before his coming, by the resemblance of Sacrifices; in the Passion of Christ it was truly exhibited; After the Ascension of Christ, it is celebrated by the Sacrament of Commemoration.* And again, *Was not Christ once sacrificed in his Body? and yet he is sacrificed to the people in a sacred sign every day.* And again, *That which we call a Sacrifice, is a sign or representation of the true Sacrifice.* Thus doth St. *Austin* explain himself, and if thus explain'd, the Vindicator can any way avail either himself or his cause, by his testimony, he hath free liberty so to do.

I believe and profess, That in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is truly, really, and substantially, the Body and Blood together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a change or conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Blood; which Conversion or Change the Holy Church calls Transubstantiation.

THIS Doctrine, he saith, is founded in the express words of Christ, who said, *This is my Body, This is my Blood.* To this I answer, These

These and the other words of Institution having been considered already, and no new matter here offered, I shall not need to trouble my self, nor the Reader, with the Repetition of what hath been already said. And this being the only Scripture proof he here alledgeth, I shall only referr you to what I have said of it in the foregoing Article, and so wait upon the Vindicator to his Authorities.

The Authorities which he here produceth (if they be any thing to his purpose) must be acknowledged to be ancient, and the Authors of good Credit. Whether therefore they will serve the end which he aims at, we shall now enquire.

His first Evidence is, St. Ignatius Martyr in Ep. ad Smyrn. where speaking of some Hereticks of his time, he saith, *They do not allow of Eucharists and Oblations, because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our Sins, and which the Father in his mercy raised again from the dead.*

These words are indeed thus cited by Theodoret Dial. III. *Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσφορὰς ἐκ ἀποδέχονται.* *They do not receive the Eucharists and Oblations.* But in the Copy of this Epistle, which is to be seen in the Florentine Library, and is generally thought to be the most genuine, we find this passage thus worded, *Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχὰς ἀπέχονται.* *They recede or abstain from Eucharists and Prayer.*

But this only by the bye ; the stress of his Argument lies not in this, but in the reason of their recession and refusal, which was, Because they did not confess that the Eucharist was the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our Sins, and was raised again.

These words at first sight to an unthinking Man, may seem to conclude the point ; but if we consider who they were that refused the Eucharist for this reason, it will much abate the force of them. That they were Hereticks the Vindicator owns, and what their Heresie was, Ignatius will tell us ; They denied Christ to be a perfect Man, they held that he had not a true humane, but only a fantastical Body ; That he did not really, but in appearance only, suffer upon the Cross, and rise again from the Dead. Against these the holy Martyr, in the beginning of this Epistle, bends his whole discourse ; his whole business being to make it appear, That Christ was truly born of the Virgin Mary, truly baptized of John in Jordan, truly suffered under Pontius Pilate, and was truly raised again from the Dead.

Now what wonder is it, that those who did believe that he never had any real Body, should refuse and reject with scorn his Sacramental Body, when offered to them ? For, what Sacrament, what Sign, what Remembrance, what Representation can there possibly be of that,

Chrysoft.
in Matth.
Hom. 83.

that, which in truth never had any Being? The whole importance therefore of these words is only this, These Hereticks would not believe the Eucharist to be the Sacramental Body of Christ, because they did not believe that ever he had any real Body. St. Chrysostome speaking of some such in his time, who would not believe that Christ really suffered; tells us in what manner they used to convince them; *When they say, How may we know that Christ was offered? bringing forth these Mysteries, we stop their mouths. For if Christ died not, whose Sign and Token is this Sacrifice? Where he calls the Eucharist a Mystery, a Sign, and a Token, i. e. A Representation of the Death of Christ; and in this sense are we to understand the Holy Martyr Ignatius in this place.*

His next witness is St. Hilary l. 8. *de Trinit.* where he saith, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. There's no place left for doubting of the Reality of his Flesh and Blood; for now, both by the Profession of Christ himself, and by our Faith, 'tis truly Flesh, and truly Blood. Is not this Truth? It may indeed not be true to them, who deny Christ to be God.*

To this I answer, That the words which St. Hilary here quoteth are in John vi. 55. In which whole Chapter our Saviour speaketh not one word of the Eucharist, that not being instituted till two years after, or thereabouts. Nor doth he there speak of a Corporal eating, which is done by the Mouth of the Body; but of a Spiritual eating, which is done by Faith. For He is there speaking to the Capernaum Jews, who followed him for the Loaves, and takes occasion from their gluttonous Appetite, to instruct them better; to acquaint them with another kind of Food, a Celestial Bread, of which whosoever eateth, liveth eternally; and that Bread is Himself. And of this it is that he saith, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed.* And lest they should understand him carnally, he closeth up his Discourse with these words, *The words which I speak unto you are Spirit and Life, v. 63.* And that in this sense St. Hilary is here to be understood, I do not doubt; for in these very words he saith, *It is so by our Faith, i. e. to them that believe; and the truth of it will not be denied by any, but those who deny the Divinity of Christ, i. e. who deny him to be the Bread which came down from Heaven, v. 50.* For it was not his Flesh and Blood, but his Divinity that came down from Heaven.

But if we should grant that St. Hilary in this discourse had an eye to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as I do believe he had, yet doth he very well explain himself, and give us to understand, that he doth not speak of Bodily but Spiritual Meat, not of Corporal but Spiritual eating, not of receiving Christ by the Mouth of the Body, but by

by the Mouth of the Soul, which is Faith. For in the very same Book that is here quoted, he saith, *Christ is in us* (not bodily, but) *by the Mystery of the Sacraments.* And again, *We receive Christ truly* (not substantially, but) *under a Mystery.* And in another place he speaks of *drinking of the Fruit of the Vine.* Which, as St. Chrysostom saith, *Doth certainly produce Wine, not Water: And I may add, nor Blood.*

Hilar. in
Matth.
Can. 30.
Chrysost.
in Matth.
Hom. 83.

His next Quotation is out of St. Chrysostom, l. 3. de Sacerd. where that Holy Father in an Ecstasy cries out, *O Miracle! He that sits above with his Father, at the very same instant of time is here in the Hands of all; he gives himself to those that are willing to receive him.*

To this I answer, That it was usual with the Ancient Fathers, by vehement Expressions, and Rhetorical Amplifications, to ravish the Minds, and inflame the Devotions of their Hearers, we very well know; and that it was as frequent with St. Chrysostom as any other, cannot be unknown to any who have been conversant in his Writings. I shall only trouble you with one Instance, which the Vindicator may find in the same Book which he here quotes, *Christ is Crucified before our Eyes, his Blood gusheth out of his side, and streameth, and floweth over the Holy Table, and the People are therewith made red and bloody.* Did St. Chrysostom intend to be understood plainly and literally here? Surely the Vindicator will not say so, nor, if he well consider, will he think it fit to understand him so in the place by him alledged; for if so, then must he grant, That the People do verily and indeed see Christ's very Body, and handle and touch it with their Fingers; which some of his own Doctors will be ready to tell him is not only false, but a worse Heresie than ever was defended by Berengarius. The Miracle therefore which St. Chrysostom here speaks of, is not the fleshly or bodily presence of Christ in the Sacrament, but the wonderful Effects that God worketh in the Faithful, in that dreadful time of the Holy Communion, wherein the whole Mystery of our Redemption, by the Blood of Christ, is expressed.

But if this place of St. Chrysostom doth not so fully express the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the Vindicator hath another, which he thinks will sufficiently do it; and that is in his 83. Hom. in Matth. where he saith, *He that wrought those things at the last Supper, is the Author of what is done here. — We hold but the place of Ministers, but he that sanctifies and changes them, is Christ himself.* Of what change St. Chrysostom here speaks, he himself doth plainly intimate; for in the same Homily, he immediately adds, *So is it also in Baptism,* as if he should have said, As in the Sacrament of Baptism, the Water is changed from common to sacramental Water; so in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Bread and Wine are changed from common to sacramental.

cramental Bread and Wine. And that he meant only this, and not any substantial Change, is plain; for, in the same Homily, he saith, *When he would represent the Mysteries, he gave Wine.* And in another place he saith, *As the Bread before it is Sanctified, is called Bread; when by the Intercession of the Priest, divine Grace hath sanctified it, it loseth the Name of Bread, and becomes worthy to be called the Body of Jesus Christ, although the Nature of Bread abides in it.* And in another place he saith, *If it be dangerous to employ the Holy Vessels about common uses, wherein the true Body of Jesus Christ is not contained, but the Mysteries of his Body; how much rather the Vessels of our Bodies, which God hath prepared to dwell in.* By all which we may plainly understand what St. Chrysostom's Thoughts were of a substantial Change, or of Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist, when they were cool and calm, and free from any Ecstatical Rapture.

Chrysost.
Ep. ad Ca-
sar.

Chrysost.
in Matth.
Opere Im-
perf. Hom.
11.

Tertul.
contra
Marcion.
l. 4.

Cyrl. Hi-
erol. Ca-
tech. Myft.
3.

His next is St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in *Catech.* whence he quotes these Words, *Since therefore Christ himself thus affirms and says of the Bread, This is my Body, and, This is my Blood; who can doubt of it, and say it is not his Blood?* (No body certainly; for in the same sense that Christ said it was so, there is no doubt to be made but that it is so, i. e. Sacramentally and in a Mystery; but here is to be noted, that if St. Cyril be to be understood literally, he will be no good Evidence for the Vindicator; for he doth not say of the Bread, *it is changed into his Body*, but, *it is his Body*, &c. So that according to him, the Bread must be Christ's Body, and the Cup his Blood, which as yet they have not had the confidence to affirm, nor indeed will it consist with their notion of *Transubstantiation*. And if it be to be understood Figuratively, it will less serve his purpose; for then it will import no more than what Tertullian saith, *Christ took Bread, and made it his Body, by saying, This is my Body; i. e. The Figure of my Body.*) But he further enforceth his Argument, saying, *In Cana of Galilee he once by his sole Will turned Water into Wine, which resembles Blood; and doth he not deserve to be credited, that he changed Wine into his Blood?* (Yes, no doubt, when he tells us that he did so; or when we have as clear Evidence of his changing Wine into Blood, as we have of his changing Water into Wine at the Marriage Feast in *Cana of Galilee*. In this he appeals to Sense, bidding the Servants draw out now, and carry it to the Governor of the Feast, that he might taste it. But in the other we are required to believe against all Evidence of Sense.) But to clear the point more fully, St. Cyril himself will tell us what kind of change he here speaks of; for, saith he, *As Bread in the Eucharist, after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no more common Bread, but is the Body of Christ; so this Holy Ointment is no more that Ointment, i. e.* As

agree with him; for in a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, (as the Article which he here undertakes to defend calls it) the thing offered ought to be visible, and there ought to be a Destruction of it in the Sacrifice; none of all which appears to be in this Action of our Blessed Saviour.

But he proceeds, *Which (saith he) being done in an unbloody manner, and offered to God, we call it an unbloody Sacrifice; and it being for the Remission of Sins, 'tis likewise propitiatory.*

To this I answer, 1. The Vindicator here takes that for granted, which we can by no means allow him, viz. That the Body of Christ was given and broken Mystically, and the Chalice shed for the Remission of Sins, before his Passion on the Cross. And why we cannot admit of this, I have given you an Account already. 2. He contradicts himself, for he tells us, *This was done in an unbloody manner;* and yet he had before told us, *That the Chalice was shed,* by which I suppose he means (if he have any meaning in it) the Blood in the Chalice: Now if Christ's Blood was shed, how could it be done in an unbloody manner? Or how could it be called an unbloody Sacrifice? 3. He tells us, *It was offer'd to God,* but how doth that appear? That our Saviour in his last Supper did indeed offer Bread and Wine to his Disciples, is very plain and evident; but that he offered either them or any thing else to God, the Words of Institution give us no account. 4. *That it being for Remission of Sins, it was likewise propitiatory.* And here he is under a great mistake, for every thing, that is for Remission of Sins, is not a propitiatory Sacrifice. The Baptism of John, and his Preaching, was for the Remission of Sins, *Mark i. 4.* And so likewise is Baptism and Repentance, *Acts ij. 38.* And yet, I suppose, the Vindicator will not say, That either Baptism, or Preaching, or Repentance are propitiatory Sacrifices. But perhaps he will say, That all shedding of Blood made for Remission of Sins, is a propitiatory Sacrifice. I cannot consent to him in this neither, for there is a shedding of Blood sacramental and not real, which is made to represent the shedding of Christ's Blood upon the Cross, and that is no propitiatory Sacrifice. But what if it be real? Though it be, yet will not the proposition be universally true; for the Blood of our Lord was really shed, and for Remissions of Sins too, at his Circumcision; and yet Circumcision was no Sacrifice. In a true propitiatory Sacrifice three Things are required. 1. There must be a real Effusion of Blood. 2. That real Effusion of Blood must be for the Remission of Sins. 3. That Effusion of Blood must be by the Death of the thing offered. None of which are to be found in this Action of our Blessed Saviour at his last Supper, and therefore it could not be a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice.

But if we should grant (which we cannot do) that this were a Sacrifice, and a propitiatory Sacrifice too, will it by a necessary Consequence follow, that every Mass-Priest at this day doth in the Mass offer a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, for the Living and the Dead ? Yes, saith the Vindicator, For, though Christ was offered but once upon the Cross, (of which St. Paul speaketh, *Hebr. vij. 27.*) yet in this manner, as Christ offered himself at his last Supper, we believe that the Apostles and their Successors were commanded to repeat it, in a perpetual memory, and representation of his Death and Passion, by Christ's own Institution, when he said to them, *Do this in remembrance of me* ; in which words he gave them power of doing the same that he had done. To this I answer, That in the same manner as Christ offered himself at his last Supper, he is offered still ; *i. e.* Sacramentally ; and that by the command of Christ we are obliged often to celebrate or repeat this Sacrament in memory of his Death and Passion upon the Cross : And that by virtue of those Words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Power was give to the Apostles and their Successors to do the same thing he did, *i. e.* to celebrate this Sacrament in memory of his Death and Passion on the Cross. All this we readily grant, but what is all this to the Priest's Offering in the Mass, a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead ?

Those of the Roman Communion do indeed lay great stress upon these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, pretending to find therein a power given to every Mass-Priest to offer up the Son of God as a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, for the Living and the Dead. But if they would but consult St. Paul, he would better inform them what the importance of these words is : For after he had recited the words of Institution, and in the close thereof these very words, *Do this in Remembrance of me* ; in the very next words he tells them what it was they were to do in remembrance of him, saying, *As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come*, 1 Cor. xi. 26.

2. Having gone as far as he can with his Scripture proofs, he calls in the assistance of Antiquity, telling us with sufficient confidence, *That this (i. e. the matter contained in this Article) is the Sense of the Primitive Fathers*. Whether it be or no, is the thing we are now to consider ; and for that purpose I shall examine his Quotations out of them.

His first Witness is St. Chrysost. *Hom. 7.* (I suppose he means 17.) in *Ep. ad Hebr.* where it is said, *We still offer the same Sacrifice, &c.*

To this I answer, What St. Chrysostom meant by those words, I know no body can better inform us, than St. Chrysostom himself, who immediately

immediately subjoins, *καὶ ὁ δὲ ἀναμνησκόμενος τοῦ αὐτοῦ θύματος*: Or to speak more properly, we make a commemoration of the same Sacrifice. And in the same Homily, had the Vindicator carefully perused it, or been so honest as to have noted it, he might have found such Expressions as these, *We offer indeed, but it is in remembrance of his Death. This Sacrifice is an Example of that Sacrifice. This which we now do, is in commemoration of that which hath been done.* But that which the Vindicator seems to lay the great stress upon, is, That St. Chrysostom in this Homily, and likewise, *l. 6. de Sacerd.* calls the Eucharist a Sacrifice. We grant it, but if he will let him explain himself, he will tell him upon what account he so calleth it in this Homily, *Because it representeth the Sacrifice of our Lord's Death, and therein we commemorate the same till his coming again.* And in the other place, *Because we pray unto God, that he would receive the Sacrifice of his Death as a satisfaction for our Sins.*

His next Evidence is St. Ambrose, *sup. Ps. 38.* Where he speaks of the Priest's offering Sacrifice for the People, and of Christ's being offered up upon Earth, when his Body is offered. St. Ambrose in the same place explains himself, saying, *The Shadow went before, the Image followed, the Truth shall be. The Shadow in the Law, the Image in the Gospel, the Truth in the Heavens. O Man, go up into Heaven, and thou shalt see those things whereof here was an Image and a Shadow.* Where he plainly tells us, that what is done here upon Earth, is only an Image or Representation. And in another place he saith, *We have In Luc. 1. seen him and look'd upon him with our Eyes, and we have thrust our Fingers 5. c. 7. into the print of his Nails. For we seem to see him, that we read of, and to have beheld him hanging upon the Cross, and with the feeling Spirit of the Church to have searched his Wounds.* Now as St. Ambrose here saith, *We see him hanging on the Cross; &c.* In like manner doth he say, *He is offered up upon Earth, when his Body is offered.* For as their own Gloss upon the Sentences of Prosper saith, *Christ is Sacrificed, i. e. his Sacrifice is represented, and a commemoration is made of his Passion.*

His next Authority is Cyril. *Alex. Anath. 11.* *We celebrate in our Churches an Holy, Life-giving, and Unbloody Sacrifice.* What St. Cyril meant by this Unbloody Sacrifice, he himself will best inform us, if we consult him about it; for in another place he saith, *We having left the gross Ministry of the Jews, have a commandment, to make a fine, contr. Julian. 1. 10. and spiritual Sacrifice. And therefore we offer unto God for a sweet smelling savour all manner of Vertues, Faith, Hope, Charity.* And in the same sence that he calls these Sacrifices, doth he call the Eucharist an unbloody Sacrifice i. e. A Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

His last Reserve is St. August. who *l. 9. Confess. c. 13.* speaks of his Mother Monica desiring to be remembered at the Altar after her death;

because she knew that thence was dispens'd the Holy Victim, by which was cancelled the Hand-writing, which was contrary unto us. And *Serm. 32. de Verb. Apost.* where he speaks of a propitiatory Sacrifice, and Alms offered for Souls departed; and of commemorating the Dead at the Sacrifice; and of a Sacrifice being offered for them.

That Christians did usually meet to celebrate the memorial of Holy Martyrs, and others departed in the Faith of Christ; and that some kind of prayers were in St. *Austin's* time used for the dead, we say not. But these are not the things in question, but whether in the Mass there be offer'd a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead. To prove this he produceth these passages of St. *Austin*, wherein he seems to call the Eucharist, *the holy Victim*, and *the Sacrifice*. Now what St. *Austin* meant by these words he himself shall tell you.

August. ad Petr. Diacon. c. 19.

Id. de Civ. Dei l. 17. c. 17.

Id. contr. Faustum, l. 20. c. 21.

Id. Epist. ad Bonifac. 23.

Id. de Civ. Dei l. 10. c. 5.

In his Book of Faith he calls it, *A Sacrifice of Bread and Wine offered in Faith and Charity*, and *A Commemoration of the Flesh of Christ which he offered for us*, and of the Blood which he shed for us. And in another place, *To eat the Bread in the New Testament, is the Sacrifice of Christians*. And again, *This Flesh and Blood of Christ was promised before his coming, by the resemblance of Sacrifices; in the Passion of Christ it was truly exhibited; After the Ascension of Christ, it is celebrated by the Sacrament of Commemoration*. And again, *Was not Christ once sacrificed in his Body? and yet he is sacrificed to the people in a sacred sign every day*. And again, *That which we call a Sacrifice, is a sign or representation of the true Sacrifice*. Thus doth St. *Austin* explain himself, and if thus explain'd, the Vindicator can any way avail either himself or his cause, by his testimony, he hath free liberty so to do.

I believe and profess, That in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is truly, really, and substantially, the Body and Blood together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a change or conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Blood; which Conversion or Change the Holy Church calls Transubstantiation.

THIS Doctrine, he saith, is founded in the express words of Christ, who said, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*. To this I answer, These

These and the other words of Institution having been considered already, and no new matter here offered, I shall not need to trouble my self, nor the Reader, with the Repetition of what hath been already said. And this being the only Scripture proof he here alledgeth, I shall only referr you to what I have said of it in the foregoing Article, and so wait upon the Vindicator to his Authorities.

The Authorities which he here produceth (if they be any thing to his purpose) must be acknowledged to be ancient, and the Authors of good Credit. Whether therefore they will serve the end which he aims at, we shall now enquire.

His first Evidence is, *St. Ignatius Martyr* in *Ep. ad Smyrn.* where speaking of some Hereticks of his time, he saith, *They do not allow of Eucharists and Oblations, because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our Sins, and which the Father in his mercy raised again from the dead.*

These words are indeed thus cited by *Theodoret Dial. III.* *Εὐχαριστία καὶ προσφοράς οὐ ἀποδέχονται.* *They do not receive the Eucharists and Oblations.* But in the Copy of this Epistle, which is to be seen in the *Florentine Library*, and is generally thought to be the most genuine, we find this passage thus worded, *Εὐχαριστία καὶ προσφοράς ἀπέχονται.* *They recede or abstain from Eucharists and Prayer.*

But this only by the bye ; the stress of his Argument lies not in this, but in the reason of their recession and refusal, which was, Because they did not confess that the Eucharist was the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our Sins, and was raised again.

These words at first sight to an-unthinking Man, may seem to conclude the point ; but if we consider who they were that refused the Eucharist for this reason, it will much abate the force of them. That they were Hereticks the Vindicator owns, and what their Heresie was, *Ignatius* will tell us ; They denied Christ to be a perfect Man, they held that he had not a true humane, but only a fantastical Body ; That he did not really, but in appearance only, suffer upon the Cross, and rise again from the Dead. Against these the holy Martyr, in the beginning of this Epistle, bends his whole discourse ; his whole business being to make it appear, That Christ was truly born of the Virgin *Mary*, truly baptized of *John* in *Jordan*, truly suffered under *Pontius Pilate*, and was truly raised again from the Dead.

Now what wonder is it, that those who did believe that he never had any real Body, should refuse and reject with scorn his Sacramental Body, when offered to them ? For, what Sacrament, what Sign, what Remembrance, what Representation can there possibly be of that,

Chrysost.
in Matth.
Hom. 83.

that, which in truth never had any Being? The whole importance therefore of these words is only this, These Hereticks would not believe the Eucharist to be the Sacramental Body of Christ, because they did not believe that ever he had any real Body. St. Chrysostome speaking of some such in his time, who would not believe that Christ really suffered; tells us in what manner they used to convince them; *When they say, How may we know that Christ was offered? bringing forth these Mysteries, we stop their mouths. For if Christ died not, whose Sign and Token is this Sacrifice?* Where he calls the Eucharist a Mystery, a Sign, and a Token, i. e. A Representation of the Death of Christ; and in this sense are we to understand the Holy Martyr Ignatius in this place.

His next witness is St. Hilary l. 8. de Trinit. where he saith, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. There's no place left for doubting of the Reality of his Flesh and Blood; for now, both by the Profession of Christ himself, and by our Faith, 'tis truly Flesh, and truly Blood. Is not this Truth? It may indeed not be true to them, who deny Christ to be God.*

To this I answer, That the words which St. Hilary here quoteth are in John vi. 55. In which whole Chapter our Saviour speaketh not one word of the Eucharist, that not being instituted till two years after, or thereabouts. Nor doth he there speak of a Corporal eating, which is done by the Mouth of the Body; but of a Spiritual eating, which is done by Faith. For He is there speaking to the Capernaean Jews, who followed him for the Loaves, and takes occasion from their gluttonous Appetite, to instruct them better; to acquaint them with another kind of Food, a Celestial Bread, of which whosoever eateth, liveth eternally; and that Bread is Himself. And of this it is that he saith, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed.* And lest they should understand him carnally, he closeth up his Discourse with these words, *The words which I speak unto you are Spirit and Life, v. 63.* And that in this sense St. Hilary is here to be understood, I do not doubt; for in these very words he saith, *It is so by our Faith, i. e. to them that believe; and the truth of it will not be denied by any, but those who deny the Divinity of Christ, i. e. who deny him to be the Bread which came down from Heaven, v. 50.* For it was not his Flesh and Blood, but his Divinity that came down from Heaven.

But if we should grant that St. Hilary in this discourse had an eye to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as I do believe he had, yet doth he very well explain himself, and give us to understand, that he doth not speak of Bodily but Spiritual Meat, not of Corporal but Spiritual eating, not of receiving Christ by the Mouth of the Body, but
by

by the Mouth of the Soul, which is Faith. For in the very same Book that is here quoted, he saith, *Christ is in us* (not bodily, but) *by the Mystery of the Sacraments*. And again, *We receive Christ truly* (not substantially, but) *under a Mystery*. And in another place he speaks of drinking of the Fruit of the Vine. Which, as St. Chrysostom saith, *Doth certainly produce Wine, not Water*: And I may add, nor Blood.

Hilar. in
Matth.
Can. 30.
Chrysost.
in Matth.
Hom. 83.

His next Quotation is out of St. Chrysostom, l. 3. de Sacerd. where that Holy Father in an Ecstasy cries out, *O Miracle! He that sits above with his Father, at the very same instant of time is here in the Hands of all; he gives himself to those that are willing to receive him.*

To this I answer, That it was usual with the Ancient Fathers, by vehement Expressions, and Rhetorical Amplifications, to ravish the Minds, and inflame the Devotions of their Hearers, we very well know; and that it was as frequent with St. Chrysostom as any other, cannot be unknown to any who have been conversant in his Writings. I shall only trouble you with one Instance, which the Vindicator may find in the same Book which he here quotes, *Christ is Crucified before our Eyes, his Blood gusheth out of his side, and streameth, and floweth over the Holy Table, and the People are therewith made red and bloody.* Did St. Chrysostom intend to be understood plainly and literally here? Surely the Vindicator will not say so, nor, if he well consider, will he think it fit to understand him so in the place by him alledged; for if so, then must he grant, That the People do verily and indeed see Christ's very Body, and handle and touch it with their Fingers; which some of his own Doctors will be ready to tell him is not only false, but a worse Heresie than ever was defended by Berengarius. The Miracle therefore which St. Chrysostom here speaks of, is not the fleshy or bodily presence of Christ in the Sacrament, but the wonderful Effects that God worketh in the Faithful, in that dreadful time of the Holy Communion, wherein the whole Mystery of our Redemption, by the Blood of Christ, is expressed.

But if this place of St. Chrysostom doth not so fully express the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the Vindicator hath another, which he thinks will sufficiently do it; and that is in his 83. Hom. in Matth. where he saith, *He that wrought those things at the last Supper, is the Author of what is done here.* — *We hold but the place of Ministers, but he that sanctifies and changes them, is Christ himself.* Of what change St. Chrysostom here speaks, he himself doth plainly intimate; for in the same Homily, he immediately adds, *So is it also in Baptism*, as if he should have said, As in the Sacrament of Baptism, the Water is changed from common to sacramental Water; so in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Bread and Wine are changed from common to sacramental.

cramental Bread and Wine. And that he meant only this, and not any substantial Change, is plain; for, in the same Homily, he saith, *When he would represent the Mysteries, he gave Wine.* And in another place he saith, *As the Bread before it is Sanctified, is called Bread; when by the Intercession of the Priest, divine Grace hath sanctified it, it loseth the Name of Bread, and becomes worthy to be called the Body of Jesus Christ, although the Nature of Bread abides in it.* And in another place he saith, *If it be dangerous to employ the Holy Vessels about common uses, wherein the true Body of Jesus Christ is not contained, but the Mysteries of his Body; how much rather the Vessels of our Bodies, which God hath prepared to dwell in.* By all which we may plainly understand what St. Chrysostom's Thoughts were of a substantial Change, or of Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist, when they were cool and calm, and free from any Ecstatic Rapture.

His next is St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in *Catech.* whence he quotes these Words, *Since therefore Christ himself thus affirms and says of the Bread, This is my Body, and, This is my Blood; who can doubt of it, and say it is not his Blood?* (No body certainly; for in the same sense that Christ said it was so, there is no doubt to be made but that it is so, i. e. Sacramentally and in a Mystery; but here is to be noted, that if St. Cyril be to be understood literally, he will be no good Evidence for the Vindicator; for he doth not say of the Bread, *it is changed into his Body*, but, *it is his Body*, &c. So that according to him, the Bread must be Christ's Body, and the Cup his Blood, which as yet they have not had the confidence to affirm, nor indeed will it consist with their notion of *Transubstantiation*. And if it be to be understood Figuratively, it will less serve his purpose; for then it will import no more than what Tertullian saith, *Christ took Bread, and made it his Body, by saying, This is my Body; i. e. The Figure of my Body.*) But he further enforceth his Argument, saying, *In Cana of Galilee he once by his sole Will turned Water into Wine, which resembles Blood; and doth he not deserve to be credited, that he changed Wine into his Blood?* (Yes, no doubt, when he tells us that he did so; or when we have as clear Evidence of his changing Wine into Blood, as we have of his changing Water into Wine at the Marriage Feast in *Cana of Galilee*. In this he appeals to Sense, bidding the Servants draw out now, and carry it to the Governor of the Feast, that he might taste it. But in the other we are required to believe against all Evidence of Sense.) But to clear the point more fully, St. Cyril himself will tell us what kind of change he here speaks of; for, saith he, *As Bread in the Eucharist, after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no more common Bread, but is the Body of Christ; so this Holy Ointment is no more that Ointment, i. e.*

Chrysost.
Ep. ad Ca-
sar.

Chrysost.
in Matth.
Opere Im-
perf. Hom.
11.

Tertul.
contra
Marcion.
l. 4.

Cyrl. Hi-
erol. Ca-
tech. Myft.
3.

As

As the Ointment is changed, so is the Bread in the Eucharist, and no otherwise. As the Ointment, when once consecrated to an holy use, is no more common Ointment, i. e. Though it be Ointment still, and the same in substance that it was, yet it is no more the same Ointment; for, before it was Common, now it is Consecrate. So the Bread in the Eucharist, after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no more common Bread; i. e. Though it be Bread still, yet is it not common Bread; but it is the Body of Christ, i. e. The Sacrament of his Body.

His next Authority is *Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catech. c. 37.* whence he cites these words, *I do therefore now rightly believe, That the Bread sanctified by the Word of God, is changed into the Body of the Word. — Because it (the Bread) is suddenly changed by this Word, This is my Body. — And this is effected by the virtue of Benediction, by which the nature of those things that appear is Transelemmented into it.*

To this I answer, That the Bread sanctified by the word of God, is changed or Transelemmented into the body of the Word. If it be understood in the same sence that the Ancient Fathers used it, we can readily subscribe unto it; and in what sence they used it,

has been in part declared already. *Tertullian* saith, *Christ took Bread, and made it his Body, by saying, This is my Body, i. e. A Figure of my Body.* And *St. Austin* saith, *After a certain manner the Sacrament of Christ's Body is the Body of Christ.* He doth not say, *It really is, but after a certain manner.*

And in what manner it was said to be so, he himself in another place informs us, saying, *He made no doubt to say, This is my Body, when he gave the sign of his Body.* And *Theophilact* saith, *We our selves are Transelemmented into the Body of Christ.* Which, I suppose, this Gentleman will not

Tertull. contra Marcion. l. 4.

Aug. ad Bonifac. Ep. 23.

Aug. contr. Adimant. c. 12.

Theophilaet. in 6. cap. Johan.

understand, as if Believers were really and substantially changed into the Body of Christ. But to clear this point, let but *Greg. Nyssen*, who certainly best understood his own meaning, be his own Interpreter, and it will plainly appear, that by these Expressions he intended no more, than what is expressed by these and many other Holy Fathers. For in another place thus he writeth, *This Altar, whereat we stand, is by nature a common Stone, nothing differing from other Stones, whereof our Walls are built, and our Pavements laid; but after that it is once dedicated to the honour of God, and hath received blessing, it is a Holy Table, and an undefiled Altar, afterward not to be touched of all Men, but only of the Priests, and that with Reverence. Likewise the Bread, that first was common, after that the Mystery hath hallowed it, is both called, and is Christ's Body; likewise also the Wine, Christ's Blood. And whereas before they were things of small value, after the*

Gregor. Nyssen, de Sancto Baptismo.

Blessing, that cometh from the Holy Ghost, either of them both worketh mightily. The like power also maketh the Priest to be Reverend and Honourable, being by means of a new Benediction divided from the common sort of the People. Whence it is evident, That as the Altar of stone was changed from its former state, and yet remained stone still; and as the Priest is changed from what he was before, and yet remaineth the same Man still; so, and no otherwise, did the Holy Father think that the Bread and Wine are changed in the Sacrament; i. e. They are changed into Christ's Body and Blood, and yet remain Bread and Wine still.

In the next place he brings in St. Ambrose, l. de his qui Myst. initiant. where speaking of the Eucharist, he says, Shall not the words of Christ be powerful enough to change the nature of things? (Yes, no doubt, when he pleaseth so to do) you have read of the Creation of the World, that God spake, and the things were made; he commanded, and they received a Being. If therefore Christ by his Word was able to make something of nothing, shall he not be thought able to change one thing into another? Yes, certainly, when he thinks fit to do it. But the Question here is not, What Christ, as God, can do, but, what he will, or hath done? Now let us see what kind of Argument this Gentleman can find in this Topick; if he has any, it must run thus, Whatsoever Christ, as God, by his Omnipotent Power, can do, that he doth. But Christ, as God, by his Omnipotent Power, can make the Bread in the Sacrament to be his Body, therefore he doth it. Would it not be every whit as good an Argument? Christ, as God, by his Omnipotent Power, can make the Vindicator a Pope or a Cardinal, therefore he hath done it. Would not any Fresh Man smile at such an Argument, and put him in mind of an old Maxim, *A posse ad esse non valet consequentia*?

But to clear St. Ambrose from that foul Aspersions, which the Vindicator here would insinuate and impose upon him, we need but consult St. Ambrose himself; for there is none of the ancient Fathers, who has delivered his Opinion in this matter more plainly and expressly than he has done. For in the same Book which is here cited, he saith, *It is one thing that is done visibly, and another thing that is celebrated invisibly.* — Believe not only what thou seest with thy bodily Eyes, for that is better seen which thou dost not see; the thing that thou seest is corruptible, the thing which thou dost not see is for ever. Where he plainly distinguisheth between the Sacrament, and the thing signified thereby. And again, *As the Flesh of Christ, which was Crucified and Buried, was true Flesh, so this is truly a Sacrament of that Flesh.* Our Lord Jesus Christ saith, *This is my Body.* Before the Blessing of the heavenly words it is named one kind; after Consecration the Body of Christ is signified. And in

Ambr. de
his qui
initiant.
Myst. c. 3.

Eid. c. 2.

in his Book of Sacraments, he hath these expressions, *In eating and drinking we signifie that Flesh and Blood which were offered for us. Thou receivest the Sacrament in a similitude. It is the Figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord. Thou drinkest the likeness of his precious Blood.** And again, *Bread and Wine remain still the same thing they were before, and yet are changed into another thing, i. e. They are the same things really and in substance, but another thing Sacramentally and in signification.*

Ambr. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4 & 5. And l. 6. 1.

As to his last Authority, taken from St. Cyril Alex. Ep. ad Coloss. Though there be some Rhetorical aggravations, the like whereunto may be found in other of the Fathers; some of which I have given you an account of; yet do I not see, that any thing more is design'd by St. Cyril in this place, than only to assure us of Christ's real, but Spiritual presence in this Sacrament. For that he never dreamt of any real and substantial change of the Elements therein, is plain from his own words in another place, where he saith, ** Christ gave to his believing Disciples pieces of Bread, not pieces of his Body. And again, † Our Sacrament doth not assert the eating of a Man, (i. e. Flesh and Blood) that were to draw the minds of the Believers, in an irreligious manner to gross cogitations.*

* Cyril in Johan. l. 4. c. 24.
† Id. Ad Object. Theodor.

I confess also, That under one kind alone is received Christ whole and entire, that being a true Sacrament.

THIS, he tells us, is a consequence of what is declared above; and if so, then must they stand and fall together. If the foundation be defective, the Superstructure is in danger; If the Antecedent be false, the Consequence can scarce be true. Having therefore thoroughly sifted and examined the preceeding Article, and found no Foundation upon which to build our Faith, that there is any such real and substantial change wrought in the Elements of the sacred Eucharist after Consecration, as is there pretended; nor any reason to receive their monstrous and new invented Article of Transubstantiation into the Articles of our Creed, we may justly reject this which he calls a consequence thereof.

But to shew that we have other reasons, besides the inconsequence thereof, to reject this Article as a Sacrilegious robbing of the People of one half of the sacred Eucharist; let us consider the Institution of it, and the constant practice of the Church thereupon. If we consider the Institution, we shall there find that our blessed Saviour, in words as plain as possible, did institute his Holy Supper under both

kinds; we may also find, that as he did institute it, so likewise he did administer it under both kinds; we may also observe, that He who said to his Disciples, *Take, eat*, did also say unto them, *Drink ye all of this*; and in the close of all, he leaves this word of command with them, *This do in remembrance of me*, as if he should have said, what you have seen me do, the same do ye. And it is evident by the Apostles practice hereupon, that they understood this to be the meaning of their Master. And that this was not to remain a duty only during their time, but in all after Ages of the Church St. Paul is very plain, saying,

1 Cor. xi. 26. *As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye shew forth the Lords death till he come.* And as for the practice of the Church thereupon, it is very evident, that for above a thousand years after Christ, the Eucharist was always administered in both kinds. So that if we have any regard either to the Institution, or Example, or Command of Christ, or to the Practice of the Apostles, or of the Church of Christ for so many Ages; we have great reason to reject this Article as a great Novelty. And indeed so it is, for the first Foundation of it, as a thing necessary to be believed and practised, is laid in a Decree of the Council of *Constance*, in the year of our Lord 1416.

But the Vindicator will tell us, that we are mistaken here, for he pretends to find some footsteps of it in the Scriptures; and for this alledgeth certain passages out of the sixth Chapter of St. *John*, where our Saviour speaks sometimes both of *Eating* and *Drinking*, and sometimes of *Eating* only.

To this I answer. That our Blessed Saviour in that place doth not speak any thing of the Sacrament of his Body and Blood; but only of a Spiritual feeding upon him by Faith. For, when he held that conference with the *Capernaian* Jews, this Sacrament was not then instituted, nor of two years after; and therefore no conclusive Argument can be built thereupon.

But he urgeth us with the Authority of St. *Basil*, in his Epistle ad *Caesar. Patr.* where he saith, he finds these words, *It hath the same efficacy, whether a person receives from the Priest one part or more.*

Whether these be the words of St. *Basil*, or how truly they are transcrib'd, I have not the opportunity now to examine; but admitting for the present that they are, what is all this to the denying of the Cup to the Laity, and forbidding the Administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, under so severe a penalty.

But I find St. *Basil* cited by *Johannes Gerhardus* for a quite different purpose; for he brings him in speaking on this wise; *If he who by eating offends his Brother, he void of Charity; what shall be said of him, who dares idly and unprofitably*

unprofitably both eat the Body and drink the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ? And again, *What is the duty of a Christian? Let him cleanse himself from all filthiness of Flesh and Spirit; and so let him eat the Body, and drink the Blood of Christ.*

Id. in Moralib. sub finem.

But at last he urgeth us with the opinion of *Luther, Melancthon and Spalatensis*, That in this point Christ hath left no necessary precept, but that it may profitably, and lawfully be received under one or both kinds.

To this I answer, 1. That our Faith, is not founded upon *Luther's* or any other Man's assertion, but upon the Institution of Jesus Christ. 2. That *Luther* wrote his Epistle to the *Bohemians*, before he was fully grounded in the truth; and that afterwards he did retract (according to the example of *St. Austin*) many things that he had written. To this end you may find him begging and beseeching his Reader to read his former writings with pity and commiseration. Before all things, I pray and beseech the godly Reader, and I beseech him for our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that he would read these my writings with judgment, yea and with great pity; remembering that I was sometimes a Monk, a mad Papist, so drunk, so drown'd in Popery, that I was ready to kill every one, or assist and consent to their death, if in any things they differed therefrom, &c.

In præfat. Tom. 1.

I hold, That there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detain'd are help'd by the Prayers of the Faithful.

THE Vindicator here tells us, that he doth verily believe, and is fully satisfied, that there is a Purgatory; but where it is, or whether there be a true and proper Fire there, or how long that punishment lasts, these are no Articles of his Faith. He might have added, Or what it is; For the Council of *Trent*, upon which he builds his Faith, doth not tell him that. So that to subscribe to this Article, is in effect to-subscribe to he knows not What, nor Where, nor Whether, nor How long, nor indeed Why.

It may not be amiss therefore to acquaint you what the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is concerning Purgatory, which I shall do out of their most Authentick Record, viz. The Council of *Trent*, Where in it is declared, *That there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls detain'd there do receive assistance from the suffrages of the Faithful, but especially from the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar.* And all who do not believe the same, are by that Council anathematized, which makes it a necessary Article of Faith. For thus the Council determineth, *If any one*

Sess. 25. Decret. de Purgator.

Sess. 6.
 Can. 30. one shall say, that after a Man hath received the Grace of Justification, the guilt of his Sin, and the eternal punishment due thereto, is so remitted, that there remains no temporary pain to be satisfied for by him, either in this World, or in Purgatory, before he can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; let him be Anathema. And in another place the same Council tells us, That the Sacrifice of the Mass is a truly propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living, and for the Dead, who are not yet thoroughly purged. And to confirm this, there is a Canon of that Council, in the same Session in these words, If any one shall say, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only a Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, or a bare Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and not a propitiatory Sacrifice; Or that it is profitable only to him that receives it, and ought not to be offered up for the sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities both of the quick and the dead; let him be Anathema. And the Catechism ad Parochos, which always speaks the sense of that Council, teacheth the same Doctrine, telling us, That there is a Purgatory Fire, wherein the Souls of the Godly, being tormented for a certain time, are expiated; that so the Gates of the eternal Country may be opened unto them, into which nothing defiled can enter.

Part. 1.
 Art. 2. n. 5.

This is the Doctrine of the Romish Church touching Purgatory, which we are required to subscribe unto in this Article; wherein we are taught, and it is expected that we should steadfastly believe, 1. That there is a middle state for the reception of Souls departed, which is neither Heaven nor Hell. 2. That this state is a state of pain and punishment. 3. That in this state they are to satisfy for some temporary punishments, which were not accomplished nor accounted for in this life. 4. That those tormented Souls may be assisted and relieved by the Prayers and Alms-deeds of their Friends here, but especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar.

In lib. ad-
 vers. Luther.

Now this Doctrine we cannot subscribe to, having (as we think) great reason to reject it. For, 1. We do not find in holy Scripture any mention made of any other place for the reception of Souls departed, besides Heaven and Hell; and therefore we look upon it as a fond thing, vainly invented. 2. Nor do we find any the least footsteps of a Popish Purgatory, among the Primitive Fathers, nor for many hundred years after Christ. There our own Martyr *Rassenfis* deals plainly with us, telling us, That so long as there was no care of Purgatory (which fairly implies, that there was a time when Purgatory was either not known, or not much cared for) no Man sought after Indulgences; for upon that depends all the opinion of Pardons: If you take away Purgatory, wherefore should we need Pardons? Since therefore Purgatory was so lately known and received of the whole Church,

Church,

Church, (*viz.* not till the time of Boniface VIII. about the Year 1300.) who can wonder that there was no use of Indulgences in the beginning of the Church? But though there was not then, there is great use made of them now; and would you know for what reason? *Erasmus* in a witty Expression of his, will give you a true account, *They do wonderfully affect the Fire of Purgatory, because it is so profitable for their Kitchens.*

But the Vindicator will tell us, *That both Roffentis and we are mightily out in our Calculation*; for he hath found very plain Footsteps of this Purgatory, both in Scripture and Antiquity. Which whether he hath or no, is the thing now to be examined.

He produceth only one Scripture, *viz. Matth. xij. 32.* where it is said, *Whosoever shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this World, nor in the World to come.* Whence he thinks it follows by a necessary consequence, *That there are some Sins which shall be forgiven in the next World, though not in this.*

To this I answer, 1. That if we should allow him this Exposition, yet will it not thence follow that there must of necessity be a Purgatory Fire, in which the Souls departed must be purged, and have their sins pardoned. For, 1st. Whether there be any true and proper Fire there, this Gentleman knows not; it is no Article of his Faith. 2. The Purgatory they speak of, is not a place of pardon, but of pain and punishment. For, according to their Doctrine, Sin is already pardoned, before the Souls enter into Purgatory; only they are to remain there for some time, to make up some satisfaction which was not completed in this Life. But, 2^{dly}. We cannot allow him this Exposition, for it is so far from being a necessary consequence from these words, that a contrary one seems to be plainly designed therein. It shall not be forgiven, neither in this World, nor in the World to come; *i. e.* It shall never be forgiven, but shall certainly be punished both in this Life, and in that to come. So that whether we allow or disallow of this his Exposition, this Scripture will not serve his purpose.

His Argument from Antiquity makes indeed a greater shew, which is built upon these Foundations, 1. That the ancient Fathers did frequently speak of an Intermediate State between Death and Judgment. 2. That they did often make mention of a Purgatory, and a Purgatory Fire, which was to be endured before an actual entrance into Heaven. 3. That they did use Prayers for the Dead, and did think those Prayers might be advantageous to Souls departed. All which we can readily grant him, and yet reject this Article of a Popish Purgatory.

The Additional Articles in Pope Pius's Creed,

For the two first of these he quotes St. *Austin*, St. *Greg. Nyssen*, and *Theodoret*, and he might have cited a great many more, who speak of an Intermediate State, and a Purgatory Fire. But if he had attended to what they say, he might have found that the middle State they speak of, is not a State of pain and torment, but of rest and ease; and the Fire they mention is only that at the day of Judgment, when their Purgatory Fire must be extinguished.

As for St. *Austin*, it must be acknowledged, that he speaks of a purgatory Fire, and that he sometimes seems to speak of a Purgation between Death and Judgment. But he might have observed also

Aug. in 8. Qu. ad
Dulcitium. Qu. 1.

Aug. de Civit. Dei,
l. 21. c. 26.

Aug. de Fide & Ope-
ribus, cap. 16.

Aug. de Civit. Dei,
l. 21. c. 27.

with what doubting and uncertainty he speaks of it. For thus he writeth, *That there may be some such thing (as the Fire of Purgatory) after this Life is not incredible. And whether it be so or no, it may be a Question. And again, That the Spirits of the Dead may find a Fire of Transitory Tribulation, I deny not; for perhaps it is true. And again, Whether Men suffer such things only in this Life, or else some such Judgments follow even after this Life; as much as I think, the understanding of this Sentence disagreeeth not from the order of the Truth. And again, What Mean that is, and what Sins those are, which so hinder a Man from coming into the Kingdom of God, that they may notwithstanding obtain Pardon by the Merits of Holy Friends, it is very hard to find, and very dangerous to determine. Certainly, I my self, notwithstanding all my search and Study, could never attain to the knowledge of it.*

Aug. Hy-
pognost.
l. 5.

Aug. de
verb. A-
post. Ser-
m. 18.

Aug. ad-
vers. Ebr-
etat. Ser-
m. 232.

And as St. *Austin* here doubteth, so in other places, and at other times he might have found him fully resolved, and positively declaring himself against it. For thus he delivers himself: *Any other third Place after this Life, besides Heaven and Hell, we know none, neither can we find in the Holy Scriptures that there is any such. And again, There are two Habitations, the one in the eternal Kingdom of Heaven, the other in the eternal Fire of Hell. And again, Let no man deceive himself, my Brethren, for there are two places, and no third Place. He that shall not merit to reign with Christ in Heaven, without doubt shall perish with the Devil in Hell.*

As for *Greg. Nyssen*, if his Works were not corrupted by the *Origenists*, as some suspect, we confess that he speaks of a Purgatory Fire; but the Fire that he speaks of is the Fire of the last Judgment; for that there is no place of pain and torment for the purgation of Souls, between Death and Judgment, seems to be his settled Opinion; for, saith he, *The war that is in us being ended by Death, our Souls rest, having left the Field wherein the Battle was fought, i. e. The Body.*

Greg. Nyf-
sen. lib. de
dormient.

As for that of *Theodore*, in his *Scholia's* upon 1 *Cor. cap. 3.* it is a gloss directly contrary to the words of the Text. For, 1. The Apostle there speaketh of a Fire which trieth the work, and not of a Fire which punisheth the person. 2. He speaks of every Man's work, not excepting the Apostles and Martyrs, and yet the Church of *Rome* exempts them from Purgatory. By the Fire therefore here spoken of, some understand the Fire of Tribulation, or the fiery Trial, which is to be undergone in this Life; others understand it of the fiery Trial at the last Judgment, which must pass upon all; neither of which will favour a Popish Purgatory; and therefore if *Theodore* understood it of that, he was besides his Text.

For his other Foundation upon which he pretends to build his Purgatory, viz. The practice of praying for the Dead, he quotes *Tertullian*, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Epiphanius*, *Chrysostom*, and *St. Austin*, but without any direction where to find his Quotations. But that is not much material, for we willingly grant that this was an ancient practice in the Church; but that they intended thereby to deliver Souls out of Purgatory we deny; for it is certain their Prayers were made for the best Men, for the Holy Apostles, the Martyrs and Confessors of the Church, and for the blessed Virgin her self; all which they thought were then in complete happiness, and who, the Papists themselves say, never touch'd at Purgatory by the way. And though it was frequently practised, yet was there no determination of the Church in that point, but it was wholly left to the Piety and Opinion of particular Men.

But if the Vindicator have a mind to be better informed in this matter, I would commend unto him a little, but learned Treatise printed at *London* this last Year, intituled, *A short Summary of the principal Controversies between the Church of England and the Church of Rome*. In which he will find these two Points fully cleared. 1. That a middle State between Death and Judgment, which is neither Heaven nor Hell, does not prove a Popish Purgatory. And, 2. That the ancient practice of praying for Souls departed, does not prove that there is a Popish Purgatory, or that those ancient Christians did believe that there was. Which are the two Foundations upon which he here builds.

I hold that the Saints reigning with Christ are to be Honour'd and Invoked, that they offer Prayers to God for us, and that their Relicks are to be had in Veneration.

I most firmly hold, That the Images or Pictures of Christ, of the Blessed Mother of God always a Virgin, and of other Saints, ought to be kept and reserved, and that due Honour and Veneration ought to be given them.

IN the former of these Articles we are required firmly to believe and stedfastly to hold, 1. That the Saints reigning with Christ are to be honour'd. 2. That they are not only to be honour'd, but invoked and prayed unto. 3. That those Saints do offer Prayers to God for us. And, 4. That their Relicks are to be had in Veneration.

In the other it is required, that we firmly hold, 1. That the Images or Pictures of Christ, &c. ought to be kept and reserved. And, 2. That due honour and veneration ought to be given them.

That the Saints reigning with Christ are to be honoured, we willingly grant; we hold their Memories to be very precious, and we think we ought to follow those pious Patterns, and imitate those holy Examples which they have left us; which is the greatest honour that we can do them. But that they are to be invoked, call'd upon, or pray'd unto, we cannot consent; because we have no warrant for it either in the Word of God, or any good Antiquity. Whether they do offer Prayers to God for us, as it is not very certain, so is it not any part of the question between us; nor, if it be granted, will it warrant our praying to them. As for their Relicks, those that are truly such, viz. their Sepulchres, their Memories, their Writings and their good Examples, we have a great Veneration for them, and do think that they ought not only not to be exposed to any contempt or disgrace, but that a very great respect and regard ought to be paid them. But that all those things which the Church of Rome tells us are the Relicks of Saints, are really such, we cannot agree; nor can we go along with them in paying them that Veneration which they do; we cannot repose any confidence in them, nor expect any help or assistance from them, nor hope to have our Prayers heard in this place rather than in another, upon the account of some Relicks being there. As for their Images, and the honour and veneration due to them; it had been well, if either Pope Pius or his Vindicator had thought fit to explain themselves, and told us what kind of honour and veneration they mean. The Vindicator indeed saith, *That they being things*

relating to God, it must be another kind of Regard, Honour, and Veneration than is usually given to prophane things. But whether this is, or ought to be called a Religious Honour, is matter of dispute, but no matter of his Faith. And that as for the manner, or external profession of it, it ought to be measured from the intention of the Church, so that we are still as far to seek for the meaning of it, as before. Now, where can we hope to find what the intention of the Church is, unless it be in the Council of Trent and its Catechism, out of which Pope Pius extracted these New Articles? It may not be amiss therefore before we proceed any further, to see what that Council hath determined in these two points, viz. *The Invocation of Saints*, and *the worship of Images*, which are the two things promoted in these two Articles, and which this Gentleman hath here undertaken to vindicate from Novelty.

I. Touching the Invocation of Saints, The Council hath defin'd, *That the Saints reigning with Christ do offer their Prayers unto God for us.* But is this all? No, it farther declares, *That it is a good and profitable thing for us in an humble manner to pray unto them.* But is this all yet? No, *We must have recourse to their Prayers, Aid and Assistance.* Nor is this all, for *the Bodies of Holy Martyrs, and others now living with Christ, which have been the living Members of Christ, and Temples of the Holy Ghost, veneranda sunt, are to be worshipped or had in veneration.* And it expressly damns all those who teach, *That Veneration and Honour are not due to the Relicks of the Saints; or, that it is not profitable to honour these Relicks, and other sacred Monuments of the Saints; or, that it is in vain to frequent the Memories of the Saints, and that, eorum opis impetrandæ causâ, to obtain their help and assistance.*

Concil.
Trident.
Sess. 25.
Decret. de
Invocati-
one, &c.

Thus far the Council, which is seconded by the Catechism, which saith, *We pray to God, either to give us good things, or to deliver us from evil; but because the Saints are more acceptable to him than we are, we beg of them to undertake our cause, and to obtain for us those things we stand in need of.* From whence it comes to pass, that we use two very different Forms of Prayer; for to God the proper manner of speaking is, *Have pity on us, Hear our Prayer, whereas we only desire the Saints to pray for us.* But then it follows, *Though it be lawful on another account to pray to the Saints, that they would have pity on us, for they are mighty merciful.* And in another place it saith, *Invocandi sum, &c.* They are to be prayed unto, because they are continually in God's presence, and most willingly take upon them *patrocinium salutis nostræ*, the patronage of our Health and Safety, which is committed to their care.

Catech. ad
Parochos,
Part 4. Tit.
Quis sit
Orandus?

II. Concerning the Worship of Images, that Council hath also defin'd, *That the Images of Christ, of the Virgin-Mother of God, and of*

Seff. 25. other Saints, are to be had and retained in Churches. But is this all? No,
 Decret. de All due honour and veneration is to be given to them. And how is this to
 Invocatio- be given? By kissing those Images, uncovering the Head, and pro-
 ne, &c. strating our selves before them. And is all this for no other end, but
 only to excite in us the remembrance of those they represent? Cer-
 tainly the Council intended something more, for it builds this Defi-
 nition upon the second Council of Nice, in which it was ordained,
 Concil. 2. That the Images of Christ, of the blessed Virgin Mary, and of the Saints,
 Nicæn. 3. should not only be received into places of Adoration, but also should be adored
 Action. 4, & 6. and worshipped. And so the Catechism explains it, for we are there
 Catech. ad told, That to make and honour the Images of Christ the Lord, of his most
 Parochos, holy and immaculate Mother, and of other Saints, is an holy and most cer-
 part 3. de tain argument of a grateful mind. But is this all? No. It is not only
 cultu & lawful to have Images in Churches, and to give Honour and Worship to
 Invocat. them; provided that Honour which is given to them be referred to their Pro-
 Sanct. totypes, but also it is for the greatest good and benefit of the Faithful so to
 do. But is this all yet? No. The Images of Saints are placed in Temples,
 ut colantur, that they may be worshipped.

This is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome in these two Articles, as it is delivered by the Council of Trent, and the Catechism ad Parochos, out of which these and the other new Articles were collected by Pope Pius IV. Which Doctrine we can by no means comply with, nor subscribe to. For,

I. As for the Invocation of Saints, 1. We look upon it as a fond thing, vainly invented, grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God. 2. We think it to be highly derogatory to the Mediatorial Office of Jesus Christ. 3. We look upon Prayer as an eminent Act of Religious Worship, which we think to be due to God alone, and ought not to be given to any Creature. And,

II. As for the Worship of Images. We think that it is an absolute breach of the second Commandment, which forbids the worship of Images, and that in words so large and comprehensive, that there is no room left for Evasion. For, 1. It forbids all external acts of Adoration, as bowing down to them, or before them. 2. It doth not only forbid the Worship of Images as Gods, but as Images and Representative Objects. 3. It doth not only forbid the Worship of the Images of Heathen Gods, but of the Lord Jehovah.

But all this notwithstanding, the Vindicator thinks he hath found out both Scripture and Antiquity, wherewith to defend both these Articles.

For the Invocation of Saints, he alledgeth Gen. xlviii. v. 16. where
 Jacob

Jacob blessing *Joseph's* two Sons, saith, *The Angel that delivered me from all evil, bless the Lads.*

To this I answer, That by *Angel* here is generally understood the Angel of the Covenant, viz. Christ the Son of God. But if we should grant him, that it is to be understood of an Ordinary Angel, yet can he not thereupon avail himself any thing in this case; for, God being pleased often to make use of the Ministry of Angels in sending succor and relief to good Men, *Jacob* prayed not unto the Angel, but to God, (as may be seen in the 15 Verse) that he would appoint the same Blessed Angel that administered unto him in all his streights, to be the Instrument of his good providence to those two Sons of *Joseph*, whom he had now made his own, and caused them to be called after his name.

He alledgeth also *Rev. i. 4. Rev. v. 8. and Rev. viii. 9.* The first of these Texts is nothing to his purpose, for the most that can be made of it is only this, *John* prays that God would send his Grace to the seven Churches, by the Ministry of the seven Spirits there mentioned, and what is all this to the matter in hand? or how will this warrant our praying to Saints departed?

Nor will his next Scripture do him any more service, for it is generally understood to be, either a Representation of the Church below, offering up prayers by her Pastors, who are the mouths of the Congregation to God; or else a Representation of the whole Church of Christ both in Heaven and Earth, joining together in their Doxologies and Praises to God for the Victories of the Lamb, and the Redemption of the World by his Blood. And this latter seems to be warranted by the very next words, where it is said, *And they sung a new song saying, Thou art worthy to take the Book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, v. 9.*

Nor will his other Text any more avail him, the 9th verse which he quotes is nothing to the purpose, but I suppose he meant v. 4. where it is said, *That the smoke of the incense which came with the prayers of the Saints, ascended up before God, out of the Angels hand.* That by *Angel*, here, we are to understand Christ, the Angel of the Covenant, they themselves dare not deny. For the Angel that offered up the Prayers of the Saints, in v. 3. is called *another Angel*, different both in Nature and Office from those other seven Angels, mentioned v. 2.

But if Scripture will not do his business, *Antiquity* he thinks will; for that, he says, is very express in all the Doctrine of this Article. And as witnesses of what he says, he names *St. Cyril Alex. St. Ambrose, St. Augustin, St. Gregory Nyssen, and St. Jerome*, but without any conclusion

rection where to find their evidence recorded. Only in the Margin he tells us, That these Quotations may be seen cited at large in *Nubes Testium*. To all which I shall only return him this Answer, That all these Quotations may be seen answered at large in *The Antiquity of the Protestant Religion*, &c. First and Second Parts, and in another Treatise intituled *Veteres Vindicati*, and in the *Answer to the Compiler of Nubes Testium*.

For the Worship of Images: All that he offers to prove is no more than this, 1. *That the making and having of Images in Churches or private Houses, is not unlawful.* 2. *That some respect and veneration is due to them*, both which we readily grant. But whether the Veneration and Honour that is due to them, ought to be called a Religious Honour? This, he tells us, is a Dispute among Divines, but no matter of his Faith. But if this be no matter of his Faith, yet it is the only matter of Debate between us and them in this point; and that it is the intention of his Church, from which he tells us, we are to take our measures as to the manner and external profession of this Honour, hath been plainly made appear from the Council of *Trent*, and the Catechism *ad Parochos*, out of which this Article is gathered. If therefore he doth not prove this, as indeed he doth not pretend to do, he is so far from vindicating the Doctrine of this Article, that he proves nothing at all. Not finding therefore any thing in his proofs that tends this way, I see no reason either to give my self or the Reader a needless trouble, by a tedious examination of them. But if there be any thing wherein this Gentleman desires a further satisfaction, I would recommend to his perusal (if he be permitted to read them) two or three small Treatises, which have lately been published upon this Subject, viz. *A Discourse concerning the Object of Religious Worship*, &c. *An Answer to a Discourse intituled, Papists protesting against Protestant Popery*, &c. *A Discourse of the Worship of the blessed Virgin and the Saints*, &c. In which if he doth not find full satisfaction in this matter, I must despair of giving him any.

I believe that the power of Indulgences has been given and left by Christ to his Church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to the Faithful.

Contin.
Sess. 25.

Decret. de
Indulg.

THE Council of *Trent* hath indeed asserted the Doctrine of Indulgences, but not explain'd it. It damns all those with an *Anathema*, who either affirm them to be unprofitable, or deny that the Church

Church hath power to grant them. And all this without once letting us know what it means by Indulgences.

The Bishop of *Meaux* in his Exposition, &c. would perswade us, that all that is intended by Indulgences, is only a Relaxation of Canonical Penance; and in compliance with him, the Vindicator here seems to be of the same opinion; for that is all that he advanceth for the Vindication of this Article.

That such a power as this was given and left by Christ to his Church, and that the due administration of it is very beneficial to the Faithful; we willingly grant. And that this godly Discipline was anciently used by the Church of Christ, we deny not. For, it is most certain, that it was the practise of the Church to enjoin penance to her offending Members, and if they did humbly and patiently submit thereunto, and prove penitent under them, she did frequently relax some part of their penance. And if this be all that is intended by Indulgences, we shall not much quarrel with him about them; but, I am apt to think, that this Gentleman will find but few of his own Communion, who will be so ready to comply with him herein, as we are. There are two eminent persons of his own Church, (if he has any acquaintance with them) viz. *Greg. de Valentia*, and Cardinal *Bellarmino*, who, if he please to consult them in this matter, will tell him another tale; The former will assure him, *That this opinion differs not from that of the Hereticks*, and makes Indulgences to be *useless and dangerous things*. And the latter will inform him, *That if this opinion be true, then there will be no need of the Treasure of the Church*, and *that Indulgences will be rather hurtful than profitable*.

Greg. de
Valentia,
de Indulg.
c. 2.
Bellarm. de
Indulg.
l. 1. c. 7.

It is plain, That these Doctors had a far different notion of Indulgences, from that which the Vindicator here would perswade us to. But it may be he will appeal from them as private Doctors; which if he do, whither will he send us to learn the Intention of the Church in this matter? The Council is silent, and gives us no Definition of the thing established by it, and their chief Pastor, who by the Bull of Pope *Pius IV.* is made the sole Interpreter of that Council, hath not by any publick Act, that we ever yet heard of, declared the sense of the Council in this Decree. So that we are still left either to spell out the intention of the Church in the Writings of their approved Doctors, or else to guess at it by the practices of their supreme Pastors. As to the former, I have already given you a taste, in two eminent Instances, and might, without any great trouble, furnish you with many more. And for the latter, we need go no farther than the Tax of the Apostolick Chamber, and the *Bullarium*; in the former of which you may find Rates set, which being paid, an Indulgence may be

Vide Bul-
lar. Tom.
I. p. 204.
Tom. III
p. 74 Tom.
IV. p. 86.

be had for almost any kind of Sin. And in the latter you have an account of several Bulls of Indulgence by several Popes, wherein a plenary, and most plenary Remission of Sins, and of all Sins is granted. Which certainly must amount to more than a bare Relaxation of some part of Canonical Penance, or else the poor People who purchased them, were horribly cheated both of their Money, and Expectations. And if this be their notion of Indulgences, we do not believe that any such power was ever given or left by Christ to his Church, or that the use of it is at all beneficial to the Faithful.

I acknowledge the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches; and I promise and swear true Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, Successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

THE Vindicator foreseeing what Objection might be made to the Catholicism of the Roman Church, begins his defence of this Article with an explanation of that Title, telling us, *That as the Catholick or universal Church, signifies a Church consisting of all particular Churches united in the Communion of the same Faith and Sacraments, and submission to the same Ecclesiastical Government, the Church of Rome is not the universal or Catholick Church, but a part of it; but as it imports a Church, which is universal in its influence, and by a singular privilege hath Authority over all other particular Churches, and is the Center of their Communion, the Church of Rome in this sense is the Catholick or universal Church, and is rightly stiled the Mother and Mistress of all other particular Churches.*

This Notion of the Catholick Church is liable to as many, if not more, Objections than the other. For, 1. Where or by whom was ever the Catholick or Universal Church understood to import a particular Church endowed with universal Influence? 2. By what singular privilege hath any particular Church this universal Influence or Authority over all other particular Churches, seeing *par in parem non habet imperium*? 3. Whence had the Church of Rome this singular Privilege? Was it from God or of Men? If from God, let her produce her Charter; if of Men, then those who gave it were superior to her to whom it was given; and certainly they did not give away their own Superiority; and if not, then the Church of Rome, instead of being a Mother and Mistress, must own her self to be a Daughter and Handmaid to another. 4. When, where, or by whom was the Church of

of Rome ever made or owned to be the Center of Catholick Union or Communion? These Questions, I doubt, will not be quickly answered, and till we are satisfied in these and some others, we shall hardly be perswaded to subscribe this Article. But why not? The Vindicator assures us, This was the Doctrine of the first Ages of the Church, and if so, then ought we rather to suspect our own Judgments, than distrust theirs.

To this I answer, That if this was the Doctrine of the first Ages, then Pope Gregory the Great (who certainly was as Infallible as any other Pope) was mightily mistaken. For, when John Bishop of Constantinople did arrogantly assume to himself the Title of *Oecumenic*, or, *Universal Bishop*; Gregory sharply reproves him for it; and tells him, *It is a New Name, a wicked, profane, insolent Name, the general plague of the Church, a corruption of the Faith, against Canons, against the Apostle Peter, and against God himself.* And he farther adds, *That never any Godly Man, never any of his Predecessors used those Titles, and whosoever doth or shall use them, is the very Fore-runner of Antichrist.* From whence it is plain, that before his time (which was about Six hundred Years after Christ) there never was any pretence made to it. But the Vindicator says there was, and that it was the Doctrine of the first Ages. Now whether Gregory or this Gentleman be in the right, is the thing in question.

Gregor. l.
4. Epist.
38, 39. &c.

The Vindicator, to make good his ground, urgeth us with the Authority of *Irenaus*, l. 3. c. 3. *adv. Har.* where he saith, *That the Church of Rome is the greatest, and most ancient of all others, founded and established there by the Two most Glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul.*—'Tis necessary that every Church should recurr to this, by reason of its more powerful principality.

To this I answer, That *Irenaus* in that Book writeth against *Valentinus*, *Cerdon*, and *Marcion*, who, contrary to the Doctrine of the Apostles, had devised certain strange Heresies; for trial whereof he appeals to those Churches which the Apostles had planted, saying, *The Church of Ephesus, first instructed by St. Paul, and afterward continued by St. John, is a sufficient witness of the Apostles learning. Polycarpus being converted, and taught by the Apostles, instructed the Church of Smyrna, and all the Churches of Asia follow it. Yet none of all these Churches ever allowed or received your strange Doctrine. Yea the very wild Barbarous Nations, that have received the Faith of Christ at the Apostles hands, only by hearing, without any Book or Letter, if they should hear of these Heresies, they would stop their Ears.* Here he appeals to the Church of *Ephesus*, of *Smyrna*, and all the Churches of *Asia*: But then he adds, *It would be too tedious to reckon up the Succession of all Churches; and*

for that reason, being himself a Western Bishop, he appeals to that Church which was of Apostolical plantation in the *West*, viz. the Church of *Rome*. Which he calls, *the greatest, most ancient, and known to all Men*. Not the most Ancient of all other Churches, as the Vindicator renders it, for it is well known, that *Jerusalem, Antioch*, and several others were more ancient; but it was then the most famous Church in the *West*. To this Church therefore he appeals, and thinks it necessary that in such cases all other Churches, i. e. all other Churches in the *West*, should do the same; and that for two Reasons, 1. Because of the more powerful principality. 2. Because in this Church the Tradition of the Apostles hath ever been kept. The latter of these, which is the principal, the Vindicator leaves out, and he had reason for it, for with that he could not serve the end he aim'd at. At that time the Tradition, i. e. the Doctrine of the Apostles, was look'd upon to be the best Trial and Rule of Faith. Which Doctrine in those early days was exactly observed in *Rome* without corruption, and for that reason was that Church had in Reverence and Estimation above others. And if the Church of *Rome* at this day did as faithfully keep the Traditions and Doctrine of the Apostles, as she did then; we would never scruple to yield her that same Honour, that *Irenaeus* gives to the ancient Church of *Rome*.

But he makes sure not to forget the other reason, viz. *The more powerful principality*. And yet he will be as little able to avail himself of this as of the other; for the *Principality* which *Irenaeus* here means, is the *Civil Dominion*, and *Temporal State* of the City of *Rome*, which was then the Imperial City. For if we consider that this was in the Reign of *Commodus* the Emperor, who was an Heathen and a Persecutor, we cannot imagine that the Church was then possessed of any powerful *Principality*. But as in every Province there was a *Metropolis*, or chief City; so it was usual with the Fathers to call the Church planted there, the chief or principal Church. And it is well known, that upon that very account the Patriarch of *Constantinople* was, by a general Council, declared to have equal Privileges and Authority with the Patriarch of *Rome*.

And that this was all the principality that *Irenaeus* dream'd of, will appear plainly; if we consider, that when *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* was angry with the Churches of *Asia*, for not celebrating the Feast of *Easter* at the same time, and in the same manner as they did at *Rome*, and would have Excommunicated them for it; *Irenaeus* opposed his design, and sharply reprov'd him as a disturber of the Church's peace. Which certainly he would not have done, had he thought that the Church of *Rome* had been the Mother and Mistress of all Churches,

Concil.
Constant.
6.

Euseb. Hi-
stor. Ec-
cles. l. 5.
c. 23.

Churches, and that Obedience to her Bishop was necessary for every Christian, in order to his Salvation.

His next witness is *Optatus Milevitanus*, lib. 2. adv. *Parm.* Where he speaks of St. Peter's Chair being erected at *Rome*, to the end that Unity might be preserved, and that they are Schismaticks, and Sinners, and Sacrilegious, who set up themselves in defiance against the Chair of Peter.

To this I answer, That *Optatus* there writes against *Parmenianus* the *Donatist*. Now the *Donatists* were a certain Sect of Christians, broken off from the Unity of the Catholick Church, confining it to a corner of *Africa*, where they themselves dwelt; as our Neighbours of the *Roman* Communion do now to *Rome*. To convince these People of their folly and madness, and to reduce them, if possible, into the bosom of the Church, *Optatus* doth (as *Irenaeus* before him had done) appeal to those Churches which were planted by the Apostles, and particularly to the Church of *Rome*, blaming them for departing from that Faith and Doctrine which was there kept and taught; and telling them that they could not belong to the Church of Christ, so long as they continued in a state of separation from that Church. He doth not therefore require their Union and Communion with the *Roman* Church, as with the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches, but as with the keeper of the Apostolick Faith. Nor doth he require them to acknowledge the Bishop of *Rome* as the universal Head and Monarch of all Churches, for there is not one word to be found in all *Optatus* tending that way.

His next Evidence is St. Cyprian, *Epist.* 40. *There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one Chair, founded upon Peter, by the Word of God.*

The design of St. Cyprian in this Epistle, is to give an account to those to whom he wrote, of the Schismatical Sedition raised by *Felicissimus* and Five other Presbyters, in the Church of *Carthage*, and against him their Bishop; and by warning them against it to preserve them in Peace and Unity. To that end he lays down these words, *There is one God, &c.* And immediately adds, *Another Altar cannot be set up, nor a new Priesthood made, besides that one Altar, and one Priesthood. Whosoever gathereth elsewhere, scattereth. It is Adulterous, it is Wicked, it is Sacrilegious, to make way for humane Inventions, by the violation of a divine Constitution.* Whence it is plain, That by the one Church here, he meant the One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolick Church; and by the One Chair, the Episcopal Chair; Obedience whereunto preserves Unity, and Disobedience begets Schism and Sedition in the Church.

But the force of his Argument lies here, That this *One* is founded upon *Peter*, and that not by any humane, but by divine Authority, *Voce Domini*, by the Word of the Lord, i. e. as the Margin of St. Cyprian directs us, those Words of our Saviour, *Matth. xvi. 18.* where our Saviour saith, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.*

To this I answer, 1. That there are some who read these words of St. Cyprian, not *super Petrum*, but *super petram*, not upon *Peter*, but upon the *Rock*; not upon *Peter's* person, but upon his profession; or as others, upon *Christ*, who is the spiritual *Rock*, upon which St. *Peter* himself was builded. But, 2. Suppose we should grant that St. Cyprian speaks of St. *Peter's* person, what is this to the Bishop of *Rome*? for it is granted by all, that after this time, he was first settled in the See of *Antioch*, but it is questioned by many, whether ever he was fixed in the See of *Rome*? Or if he was, why should his Successors in the latter place have a better Title to it, than those in the first? But, 3. If we will suffer St. Cyprian to be his own Interpreter, he will fully clear the matter; where having occasion to explain those words of our Saviour to *Peter*, he concludes, *The rest of the Apostles were the same that St. Peter was, being joined with him in the same fellowship of Honour and Power.* Where it is plain, he gives no Supremacy to St. *Peter* over the rest of the Apostles, much less did he intend any to his Successors.

St. Cyprian.
de Unitat.
Eccles. E-
dit. Oxon.
p. 107.

But St. Cyprian must not escape thus, he is again pressed to speak in this Cause. For in his 73. *Epist.* saith the Vindicator, he hath these words, *Christ gave this power to Peter, upon whom he built the Church.*

To this I answer, That this Epistle is an Answer to one sent him by *Jubaianus*, concerning the Rebaptizing of Hereticks. Against which it is objected by *Jubaianus*, *That we are not to enquire by whom a person is Baptized, since he that is Baptized may receive Remission of Sins, if he believe.* In answer to this Objection, St. Cyprian, after he had for some time discoursed of the Faith of those who are without the Church, and the Efficacy thereof, at last concludes, *But it is manifest where and by whom that Remission of Sins, which is given in Baptism, can be given. For the Lord first gave to Peter, upon whom he built his Church, and from whence he shows the Original of Unity, that Power, that whatsoever he should loose on Earth, should be loosed in Heaven. And after the Resurrection, he also spoke to the Apostles, saying, As my Father hath sent me, so send I you; and when he had said this he breathed on them, and said, Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* Where you see he joins St. *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles in the same fellowship of Honour and Power, with this only difference,

John xx.
21.

ference, that it was given to St. Peter first, and afterwards to them all jointly. And at last he concludes, which was all that he aimed at. *By this we understand both where and by whom Remission of Sins in Baptism can be given, viz. In the Church, and by the Pastors of the Church.* And now what is all this to the Supremacy either of the Bishop or Church of Rome?

But he hath not yet done with St. Cyprian, he must come upon the Stage again to justify what he saith, *Epist. 55.* where we find these words, *They are bold to carry Letters from schismatical and profane Persons to the Chair of Peter, and the principal Church, from whence the Priestly Unity hath its rise.*

In answer whereunto, it may not be amiss to give you a short Account of the whole matter: The Story is this; *Feliciſſimus* and Five other Presbyters with him, had made an horrible Schism in the Church of *Carthage*, contending for the reception both of Hereticks and Apostates, into the Church, without any form of Ecclesiastical Discipline. These were opposed by St. Cyprian, of whose Opposition they were so impatient, that at last they proceeded, contrary to all Rule and Order, to chuse a new Bishop, and fix'd upon one *Fortunatus*. Hereupon St. Cyprian calls a Council of *African* Bishops, in which the cause was heard, and these Schismatics censured. This so inflamed their turbulent and unquiet Minds, that they resolve to carry the matter to *Rome*; and accordingly *Feliciſſimus* and others of the Party were sent with Letters from their mock-Bishop *Fortunatus*, to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*. (And this is the carrying of Letters to St. Peter's Chair, &c. that St. Cyprian here speaks of.) So soon as they were come there, and had made known their business, *Cornelius*, by Letters, acquaints St. Cyprian with it; and he in this Epistle returns him an answer.

Whence we may Note, That it was not St. Cyprian and the Catholick Bishops of *Africa*, but the schismatical mock-Bishop *Fortunatus* and his adherents, that appealed to *Rome*. Nor doth *Cornelius* take upon him to cite St. Cyprian and the *African* Bishops to appear, and answer the matter before him; but only in a Brotherly and friendly manner, by letters acquaints him with it. And so far was St. Cyprian from owning any Superiority or power in the *Roman* Bishop over himself, and the Bishops of *Africa*, that the highest titles that he gives him in this whole Epistle, are only *Brother*, and *Most dear Brother*. He also takes upon him sharply to reprove him, for his pusillanimity and lowness of Spirit, at the threats and menaces of those wicked Men; He instructs him what he should do, and directs him how to behave himself towards them. He acquaints him that the cause was

al-

already judged in *Africa*, and as good as tells him that he ought not to meddle with it: For, saith he, *it is determined by all of us, and it is both equal and just, that every ones Cause should be heard where the crime was committed.* Every Pastor hath his portion of the Flock, which he ought to rule and govern, and to give an account thereof (not at Rome, but in Heaven, not to Cornelius, but to Christ) to the Lord. Those therefore who are under our Jurisdiction ought not to run about, (i. e. they ought not to apply themselves to any foreign Jurisdiction) but to plead their cause there, where they may have both Accusers and Witnesses of their Crime. So far was St. Cyprian from owning any Superiority or Power in the Roman Bishop over himself and the *African* Bishops.

But he calls the Church of Rome, *The Chair of Peter*, and the principal Church. 'Tis true he doth so, but that he never intended thereby to ascribe unto her a Superiority and Jurisdiction over all other Churches, I take to be very plain from the account I have now given you of his sentiments out of this very Epistle. But having already accounted for these expressions, I am not willing to repeat the same thing over again, but shall rather refer you to what hath been already said.

His next evidence is *Greg. Naz. Hom. de Cre. Epist. Doar.* We do not condemn nor revile that great Pastor, who governs that magnificent City; we know him to be honourable, we acknowledge him the Head — we desire he will shew himself an indulgent and tender Father, and diligently take care of the whole Church.

To this I answer, That if by *Head*, he mean the chief Ruler and Governour; we grant that he is so in his own province, and that he take care of the whole Church of that Province, committed to his Charge, we think is his duty, and with *Nazianzen*, we heartily desire that he may do it, and do it diligently. And that this Holy Father meant no more than this, may plainly appear from what he saith of the Church of *Casarea*: *It is, saith he, in a manner the Mother of all Churches, and the whole Christian Common-wealth so embraceth and beholdeth it, as the Circle embraceth and beholdeth the Center.* Thus *Jerusalem* is frequently stiled, the *Mother of all Churches*; and St. Chrysostome calls *Antioch*, the *Head of the World*. Now as these Churches are called *Mother Churches*, because the Cities in which they were planted were the *Mother Cities* of those Provinces; so for the same reason, the Church of Rome is oftentimes called the *Chief*, the *Principal*, and the *Mother Church*, because that City, was the *Metropolis* or *Head-City* of the *West*. And as the Bishops of those Churches may be, and oftentimes are called the *Chief Rulers* and *Governours* of the Church, so likewise and no otherwise, the Bishop of Rome is sometimes stiled the *Head* i. e. the chief Governour of the Church. And that by the whole Church here, we are

Greg.
Naz. in E.
pist. ad
Casareen-
ses.
Chrysost.
ad pop.
Antioche-
num. Hom.
3.

are to understand no more, but only the whole Church of that Province, Polydor. Virgil, explaining those words of St. Cyprian, *The Chair of Peter, the principal Church from which the Unity of the Priesthood first began*, thus writeth, *Lest any man hereby deceive himself, it cannot in any other wise be said, that the Order of Priesthood grew first from the Bishop of Rome, unless we understand it only within Italy. For it is clear and out of question, that Priesthood was orderly appointed at Jerusalem, long before Peter ever came to Rome.*

Polydor.
Virgil. de
Inventor.
rerum, l. 4.

To this I might add, That every Bishop, may be called *the Bishop of the Universal Church*; because it is his duty to take care not only of his own Flock, but of the whole Church of God. As also that this Title, *Head of the Church*, hath been given to several godly Bishops, who were never Bishops of Rome, nor ever dreamt that any Supremacy of power over all other Churches, was thereby conferred either upon him, or them. But I am not willing to enter farther into the Controversie than the Vindicator leads me; And to this Evidence of his, I think, enough hath been said, to show that it will not much avail him.

His next witness is St. Chrysostome l. 2. de Sacerd. c. 1. *For what reason did Christ shed his Blood? Certainly to purchase those sheep, the care of which he committed to Peter and his Successors.*

The whole force of his Argument, if he can frame any out of these words, must be, That the Bishop of Rome is the true Successor to St. Peter. Which, if we should grant him, I do not see how it would thence follow, that the Bishop of Rome is the Supreme Pastor, Head and Governor of the Catholick Church; For if St. Peter himself was not so, he cannot have it by Succession from him. Now St. Cyprian saith, *The Apostles were the same that St. Peter was, being joined in the same fellowship of Honour and Power.* And their own Pope Gregory saith, *Peter, the Apostle, is (not the Head, but) the chief Member of the holy universal Church.* Paul, Andrew and John, what are they else, but the Heads of several Nations? Yet notwithstanding under one Head (viz. Christ) they are all members of the Church. And to speak in short, *The Saints before the Law, the Saints under the Law, the Saints in the time of Grace, all accomplishing the Lord's Body, are placed among the Members of the Church.* And there was never any one yet, that would have himself called the Universal Bishop. So that as Paul, Andrew and John were Heads of the Church, in like manner, and no otherwise, was St. Peter Head of the Church. If therefore St. Peter was, then they were all so too, for they were all equal; and what a confusion that would be, let the Vindicator judge.

De Unitate
Eccles.
Edit. Oxon.
p. 107.
Greg. l. 4.
Ep. 38.

To this may be added, That if St. Peter was really the Prince of the

the Apostles, and Head of the Church constituted by Christ, St. Paul certainly was very much to blame, *so withst and him to the face*, as he did. And it must be a very great Arrogance and presumption in him, to say, *That in nothing he was behind the very chiefest Apostles*. Or to share Jurisdiction with him, saying, *That the Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed unto him, as the Gospel of the Circumcision was unto Peter*. But St. Chrysostome, whose Authority he so much depends upon, will tell him, *That Paul had no need of Peter's help, nor did he want his voice, but was equal unto him in Honour*.

Besides all this, One may be said to succeed another, either because he possesseth the same place that he did; or because he teacheth the same Doctrine, and with the same diligence that he did. Now the former of these will not be enough to make any one the true Successor of St. Peter, for as their own *Alphonfus de Castro* saith, *Though it be matter of Faith to believe the true Successor of St. Peter is the Supream Pastor of the whole Church; yet are we not bound, by the same Faith to believe, that Leo or Clement (though Bishops of Rome) are the true Successors of St. Peter*. And yet this is the Succession they so much boast of; and if this be it, the same St. Chrysostom will inform him, *That it is not the Chair that makes the Bishop, but it is the Bishop that makes the Chair. Neither is it the place that Halloweth the Man, but it is the Man that Halloweth the place*. And St. Jerome will tell him, *They are not always the Children of Holy Men, that sit in the rooms of Holy Men*. Nor did these Holy Fathers speak without Book, for the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses's Chair, Matth. xxij. 2. And the Abomination of Desolation shall stand in the holy Place, Matth. xxiv. 15. And the Man of Sin, as God, shall sit in the Temple of God, 2 Thes. ij. 3, 4. As the first of these did Succeed Moses in place, but not in Doctrine; so the two other shall succeed Christ and his Apostles. And thus Pope Liberius, though an Arian Heretick; and Pope Celestinus, though a Nestorian; and Pope Honorius, though a Monothelite; may be said to succeed St. Peter in place, though not in Doctrine. But will the Vindicator say, or can he imagine, that St. Chrysostom meant, That Christ shed his Blood to purchase a Church, and when he had done, committed the care of it to such Successors of St. Peter as these were?

Ego nullum primum, nisi Christum, sequens, Beatitudini tue, i. e. Carbedæ, Petri Communionem consociot.

His next is St. Jerome, Epist. 57, and 58. *ad Damasum*, whose words are thus rendered by him, *I following no other Leader but Christ, am in Communion with your Holiness, i. e. with the Chair of Peter, &c. And, I cry aloud, Whoever is in Communion with the Chair of Peter, is mine*.

Which may better be Translated thus, *I following no first Man, but only Christ, am joined, as a Fellow in Communion unto thy Blessedness, i. e. to Peter's Chair*. Whence

Whence we may observe, 1. That St. Jerome doth not acknowledge any first, head, or chief in the Church, no not the Pope himself, but only Christ. 2. That he doth not submit himself as a Vassal or Subject to the Pope, but doth consociate himself in Communion with him. 3. That it is not only with him, but with St. Peter's Chair. And what he meaneth by St. Peter's Chair, he afterwards explains, when he comes to give a reason of this his Address. Where he tells us, *The Foxes destroy the Vineyard of Christ, so that among these broken Cisterns, that have no Water, it is hard to understand, where that sealed Fountain and inclosed Garden is.* Therefore he thought it good to consult St. Peter's Chair, and that Faith which was commended by the Apostles Mouth. So that it was not St. Peter's Successor in place, but in Doctrine, that he applied himself unto. Now if we consider that the Age in which St. Jerome lived did mightily abound with Hereticks, we cannot think it strange that he should forsake the company of those wicked Men, and join himself in communion with those, who then held that Faith intire, which they impugned. But if you ask me, why should he rather address himself to the Bishop of Rome, than any other? The answer is ready, he had received his Christianity at Rome, he had been educated there from his youth, he was a Priest of Rome, and had sometime been Secretary to this very Damascus. All which considered, it is no wonder, if he had a particular kindness for that See. Now what is all this to that universal power which the Pope at this day claims to have over the whole Church of God? Should the Vindicator follow St. Jerome's Example, and, and in his Address call the Pope his Fellow, I doubt it would not be very welcome.

In vita
Hieron.

And that St. Jerome meant no more than is here explained, will plainly appear, if we consider what account he made at other times of St. Peter's Chair, when he found abuses and errors maintained in the Church of Rome.

Then he cries out, *Si Autoritas quaritur, &c. If we seek for Authority, that of the World is greater than that of the City (viz. Rome) Wherever there is a Bishop, whether it be at Rome, or at Tanais, or at Engubium, he is of equal Merit, and equal Priesthood. The power of Riches, and the humility of Poverty, cannot make a Bishop either higher or lower. All Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles.*

Hieron. in
Epist. ad
Evagrium

His next Evidence is, St. Aug. Epist. 92. *ad Innocentium Papam*, whose words are not well translated by him; The words of the Epistle are these, *In the great dangers of the infirm Members of Christ we beseech you to use your Pastoral diligence. For, there is a new Heresie, and too pernicious a Tempest raised by the Enemies of the Grace of Christ, who by their wicked Disputations endeavour to take from us the Lords Prayer.* And then

L

giving

giving him an account, what that Heresie and Tempest was, he at last concludes, *But we hope, the Mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ assisting, who deigns to govern thee consulting him, and to their spite praying to him; those who think so perversely and perniciously will yield to the Authority of your Holiness, drawn from the Authority of holy Scriptures, that so we may rather rejoice in their Correction, than sorrow for their Destruction.*

For the better understanding hereof, we are to consider, That this Epistle was sent to Pope Innocent, not by St. Austin alone, but by the *Milevan Council*, in which he presided; and in which the *Pelagian Heresie* had been considered and censured; as it had been before in the Council of *Carthage*. And the design of their writing, as appears by the whole tenour of the Epistle, was not to beg his confirmation of what they had done, but to acquaint him with what they had done; and to desire him to take the same pastoral care, and use the same diligence to discountenance that Heresie in his Province, as they had done in theirs. For St. Austin in another Epistle tells him, *We have heard that there are some even in Rome it self, (where Pelagius long-lived) who for divers causes are favourable to him; some there are who report that you perswade them so to be, but more who believe that he is cleared from that Heresie by the Eastern Bishops.* And therefore they expected that he should not only clear himself of that suspicion, but also undeceive his people as to the Transactions in this matter in the East.

This was the design of this Epistle, as indeed it was of all those Communicatory Letters, which in those days were so frequent, when any matter of great importance happened in the Church; which were things of great use, and no small advantage then, for thereby Catholick Communion was preserved, warning was given of any approaching danger, and the Bishops and Pastors of the Church awakened to provide against it. Nor were these Epistles sent to the Bishop of Rome only, but to other Bishops also. To this purpose we meet with another Epistle to *Hilarius* Bishop of *Poitiers* in *France*, written in the same stile, and to whom he makes his Address in words to the same effect, as he did to the Bishop of Rome; for thus he directs it, *To Hilarius our most blessed Lord, and reverend Brother and Fellow-Bishop in the truth of Christ.* In this Epistle he tells him, That a new Heresie, an Enemy to the Grace of Christ, was endeavoured to be set up; and having given him an account what it was he desires him to use his pastoral care and diligence to suppress it.

But that St. Austin and the Fathers in the *Numidian Council* never dreamt of any power or authority either in him or the Bishop of Rome, or any other Bishop, over them and all other Churches, we need no other Evidence; than the Acts of this very Council. In which

Epist. 95.
ad Inno-
cent.

Epist. 94.

we find this Decree made, *If they have a mind to appeal from their Bishops, let them not appeal but only to the Councils of Africa, or to the Primates of their own Provinces. But if they shall make their Appeals beyond the Seas (i. e. to Rome) let no Man in Africa receive them into Communion.* The same was also decreed in the African Council; and the reasons of it are expressed at large in the Epistle of that Council to Pope Celestine.

Concil.
Milevitan.
Can. 22.

Concil.
Carthag.
6. Can. 92.

Thus have I considered the Proofs brought for Vindication of this important Article, and having laid them in the Balance, have found them all too light. But he hath yet one Authority more, not from Antiquity, but from a Modern Author, and one of our own, viz. the Reverend and learned Doctor *Sherlock*. This, I confess, I did not expect; for who would ever have thought that that worthy Gentleman should ever have been brought upon the Stage as an Advocate for the Popes Supremacy. But this Gentleman thinks, that whatsoever is said by any Body touching Order and Discipline in the Church, and the necessity of subjection and obedience to the Governors thereof, must needs terminate in the Pope, who, they say, is the Center of Unity; though in so saying, they do but beg the Question. For we can with great cheerfulness and willingness subscribe to all that Dr. *Sherlock* hath there said, and yet think our selves never a jot the more obliged to swear Obedience to the Bishop of Rome.

Disc. of the
Knowl. of
Jes. Christ,
P. 163.

I undoubtedly reserve and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject and anathematize all things contrary thereunto; and all Heresies whatsoever the Church hath condemned, rejected and Anathematized.

THIS, he tells us, is the consequence of that Doctrine of our Creed, wherein we profess to believe *The Holy Catholick Church*. But how comes this to be the consequence of that Doctrine? Very naturally, for the Church of Rome is *this Catholick Church*. 'Tis boldly said, but how doth this appear? Very plainly, for there are the greatest reasons in the world to believe it. So that now we must either show our selves to be unreasonable Men, or else of necessity we must subscribe this Article. But are we obliged to take all this upon the bare word of the Vindicator? May we not look into, and consider these reasons, whether they be so great and good as he talks off? Surely we may, or else he would not have exposed them to publick view. Well then let us see what they are.

R. 1. His first Reason is, *Because the Church of Rome has continued in a visible Succession of Pastors from Christ's time till now.*

Ans. The point of Succession hath been already considered, and, I think, enough said to show the unreasonableness of that Plea. But because he so much insists upon the visible Succession of Persons in the same place, let me ask him two or three questions. 1. Who was the Bishop of Rome next by Succession to Peter? who the second? who the third? who the fourth? For in this they are not yet well agreed. Some say *Linus* was the second, others say *Clemens*. Some say *Anacletus* was the third, others say *Clemens*. Some say *Clemens* was the fourth, others say *Anacletus*. 2. Whether an Heretick, or a Necromancer, or a Blasphemer being in the Chair, be the true Successor of St. Peter? and if not, whether that do not break the Line of Succession? 3. Whether, when there was no Pope for some Years, the visible succession of Pastors in that Church was not discontinued? 4. When there were three or four Popes at one and the same time, and not known who was the true one, there was not an apparent interruption of their visible succession?

R. 2. *Because the Church of Rome never went out of, or separated from any precedent Church, but all other separate Congregations have gone out from her.*

Ans. If by going out of, or separating from any precedent Church, he mean departing from the Doctrine, and renouncing the Discipline of that Church; which he must do, if he mean any thing; then we say, That in both these the present Church of Rome hath gone out of, and separated from the Primitive Church, as hath been plainly made appear in this Discourse. And that those who separate from her, do not separate from the Church, but from the corruptions of that particular Church; which they are well warranted to do by St. Paul, who having told the *Corinthians*, That there can be no fellowship between Righteousness and Unrighteousness; no Communion between Light and Darkness; no Concord between Christ and Belial; nor any Agreement between the Temple of God and Idols; at last thus infers, *Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15, 16, 17.*

R. 3. *Because the Church of Rome hath sent Apostles abroad, and converted all Heathen Nations to Christianity.*

Ans. This is so notoriously false, and so well known to be so, to every one that hath but looked into Church History, in which we have an account of most Nations, when and by whom they were converted; that I cannot but wonder at the Confidence of this Gentleman in asserting

ing it. But if we should grant him this, would it thence follow, That the Church of Rome is the Catholick Church? Might I not as well reason thus, The Scribes and Pharisees compass Sea and Land to gain Profelytes, therefore those two Sects were the whole Jewish Church?

Because the Church of Rome in publick Synods has opposed and condemn'd in all Ages arising Heresies. R. 4.

This is as notoriously false as the former, as is plain from those two Instances of the *Milevitan*, and *African* Councils, which I mentioned in the precedent Article; and might easily be made more plainly appear by Instances of other Councils, which have not only not desired, but rejected the Authority of the Church of Rome, when it would have imposed. But the thing is so well known that I shall not need to do it. *Ans.*

These are all the Reasons he alledgeth, and these, he tells us, are the greatest in the World. If they be so, the World is in an ill condition, and men, like the great *Nebuchadnezzar* may be sent now to graze amongst the Beasts of the Field, having lost their Reason.

I am of Doctor *Sherlock's* mind, *That Men cannot own the Authority and Government of Christ, till they submit to the publick Instructions, Authority and Discipline of the Church.* But what is all this to the Church of Rome's being the Catholick Church? 'Tis plain he doth not say it, and I am well assured he never meant it.

I subscribe to St. *Austin's* Judgment, *That particular Councils, must yield to General, because the whole is deservedly preferred before a part.* But did ever any Council, either particular or General, decree a part to be the whole, or a particular Church to be the Catholick Church? *Aug. de Bapt. cont. Don. l. 2. c. 9.* If not, I do not see how the Vindicator can avail himself of this passage, nor for what end he did produce it.

Thus it appears, that the New Articles in Pope *Pius* his Creed, are neither agreeable to Scripture, nor the Sence of the Primitive Fathers. And for that reason we cannot subscribe to this last Article.

THE CLOSE.

TO close up his Vindication, he undertakes to answer some Objections of ours against these New Articles, which, how well he hath done, I shall now examine.

The Apostles knew best what was to be believed; since therefore none of these Articles are in their Creed, they ought not to be imposed on us as Matters of Faith.

To this he answers, *That the Apostles Creed is a Summary of the principal Mysteries of the Christian Religion, but doth not contain all that is of Faith.* *Ans.*

To this I reply, That a thing may be said to be of Faith two ways, either *abso-*

absolutely or occasionally. 1. Absolutely, *i. e.* in, and for its self, when by its own nature, and God's primary intention, it is an essential part of the Gospel; such an one as Teachers in the Church cannot, without mortal Sin, omit to teach the Learners; such an one as is intrinsecal to the Covenant between God and Man; and not only plainly revealed by God, and so a certain Truth, but also commanded to be preached to all Men, and to be distinctly believed by all, and so a necessary Truth. Of this kind there are two sorts, *viz.* Such as are necessary to be believed, or such as are necessary to be done; and of the former of these it is that we speak, when we say, That the Apostles Creed contains all necessary Matters of Faith. 2. A thing may be said to be of Faith only occasionally, *i. e.* when it is not so in, and for its self, but because it is joined with others which are necessary to be believed, and for the sake of that Authority by which it is delivered. Of this sort there are multitudes of Verities contained in the Holy Scriptures; as for Instance, That *Zacharias* was a Priest of the Course of *Abia*, that *Elizabeth* was of the Daughters of *Aaron*, that *Cyrenius* was Governor of *Syria*, that *Pontius Pilate* was the *Roman* Deputy, that *Paul* left his Cloak at *Troas*. These are all Truths and Objects of Faith, because they are found in the divine Revelation; but they are not such Truths as the Pastors of the Church are bound to teach their Flock, or their Flock bound to know and remember. For it would be no crime to be ignorant of these, or to believe the contrary, if I did not know that they were delivered in Holy Scripture. When therefore we speak of Matters of Faith contained in the Creed, we mean all necessary points of meer Belief, and of such we say it is a perfect Summary.

No, saith the Vindicator, for it doth not contain all that is in the Scripture, and yet all that is there is of Divine Inspiration and of Faith. We grant it, but all things that are there are not equally of Faith; many of them are not absolute and necessary, but only occasional and accidental Objects of Faith; as I have already shown.

As for Baptism and the Lord's Supper, we acknowledge them to be great Mysteries of our Religion, but they are not points of meer Faith, and therefore not within the question. That the Scripture is, the word of God, and that such and such Books are Canonical, depends upon another Evidence; by which we must be convinc'd that they are so, before we can give a rational assent to the Articles of the Creed; because they are all taken out of these Books and our belief of them built upon that Authority. The Belief therefore of this being necessarily antecedent to the belief of the other, it would have been a very absurd and preposterous thing to have made that an Article of our Creed. As for the 39 Articles of the Church of England, they are propounded only as Articles of Communion, not as Articles of Faith; and therefore the Objection doth not reach them. And as for the *Nicene* and *Chalcedonian* Creeds, they are only explications of the Apostles Creed, and contain the same, and no other Faith, but what is contained in that. This I think, may suffice to show, That he hath not yet answered that Objection. But if the Vindicator desire yet further Satisfaction in this point, I would recommend to him (if he be allowed to read such Books) the fourth Chapter of Mr. *Chillingworth's* Book, intituled, *The Religion of Protestants*. 719

way to Salvation, and another little Treatise printed at London the last year, intituled, *The Pillar and Ground of Truth*.

All the particulars in this profession were not undoubtedly believed by all, *Object.*
before the Decrees were made at *Trent*.

To this he answers, *Suppose they were not, Neither was the Canon of Scri- Answ.*
pture, which the Church of England receives, undoubtedly believed by all in
the primitive times.

This may be allow'd to be a good answer to that Objection, but that Ob-
jection is his own, it is none of ours; Our Objection is this, *Reply.*
That not one of all
these twelve new Articles in Pope Pius's Creed was ever received as an Arti-
cle of Faith by the Primitive Church. And to this he answers nothing.

Theres no Authority upon Earth can make a new Article of Faith.

To this he answers, *That there is an Authority, which can declare a thing Object.*
to be of Faith, which was not before expressly so believed by all. *Answ.*

This we willingly grant, but this doth not answer the Objection; for we
do not question the Church's power to declare a thing to be of Faith, which *Reply.*
before was dubious, or not expressly believed by all. But we say, That there
is no such Authority in the Church, as to make that to be of Faith, which
really was not so before, *i. e.* to make a new Article of Faith. And to this he
returns not one word of Answer.

This Authority can declare only such points, as may be warranted by Holy *Object.*
Scripture, and such as these are the subject of the XXXIX Articles; but as
for Pope Pius's Creed, it is but the Invention of Men.

For Answer hereunto, he refers us to what he hath said in his Book, where-
in, he saith, he hath shewed, *That all the Articles of this Creed are founded Answ.*
upon Scripture, and the Authority of the most eminent Men in the Primitive
Church. And farther saith, That the XXXIX. Articles are not so express in
Scripture, as these of Pope Pius.

Whether there be any Truth in the first part of his Answer, as he refers *Reply.*
us to his Book, so I shall refer you to the Answer given to it in these Papers.
And to the latter part of his Answer, it may be a sufficient Reply, to remind
him of what he hath been often told, That the XXXIX Articles of the Church
of England are not propounded as Articles of Faith, but as Articles of Com-
munion, nor is the Belief of them required of all upon pain of Damnation, as
these of Pope Pius are; and therefore there is not so much danger in our com-
pliance or non-compliance with the one, as with the other. Whether these
Articles of Pope Pius be founded upon Scripture, hath been one part of the
question between us, and therefore for satisfaction in this point, I shall refer
you to what hath been said upon that Subject on both sides.

Thus have I considered the Vindicator's Answers to some Objections, which
he thought fit to encounter with; and how well he hath acquitted himself
therein, I shall now leave it to the ingenuous Reader to judge between us.